



★ No. 1310.48











\*4310.48  
SLAVERY AND THE REBELLION,  
ONE AND INSEPARABLE.

---

(S P E E C H E S )  
OF  
HON. CHARLES (SUMNER),

BEFORE THE

New York Young Men's Republican Union,

AT

COOPER INSTITUTE, NEW YORK,

ON THE AFTERNOON OF NOVEMBER 5, 1864.

---

BOSTON:

WRIGHT & POTTER, PRINTERS, NO. 4 SPRING LANE.

1864.

4232





АЛЛЕГРІЯ СВІЖАНО МО  
65511

87795

Add Aug. 22. 1868

PREFATORY NOTE.

---

The following speech was delivered by SENATOR SUMNER at Cooper Institute, New York, on the afternoon of Saturday, November 5th, 1864, before one of the largest audiences ever assembled within the walls of that capacious hall. By this publication, the YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION, at whose invitation the speech was delivered, brings to a close the arduous labors of its third presidential campaign; the last of a series of political battles, begun, prosecuted and completed, in the interest and for the furtherance of the principles, so nobly and eloquently reasserted in the Massachusetts senator's last and greatest speech.

Among the auditors, on this occasion, were at least two hundred clergymen, of all denominations, from New York, Brooklyn, Newark and other adjacent cities. Not less than one thousand ladies, and an equal number of the most eminent citizens of New York, also aided to swell the crowd that assembled to do honor to the distinguished orator and to express the sympathy and interest they felt in the great cause, in whose behalf he was announced to plead.

Besides FRANCIS LIEBER, LL. D., the widely known professor of political science in Columbia College, who was chosen Chairman of the meeting by acclamation, there were upon the platform many of the men and women of New York, whose names and deeds, in various walks of life, have illustrated the annals of Freedom's trials and triumphs in America.

Dr. LIEBER, upon taking the chair, made a brief and appropriate address, at the close of which he introduced Hon. EDWIN D. MORGAN, who read a telegram, received from San Francisco, giving assurance of a Union victory in California; the reading of this dispatch was hailed with applause and cheers. When order had been restored the Chairman presented the orator of the occasion, who was made the recipient of an ovation, such as has seldom been accorded to a speaker in New York.

The speech, throughout, was received with every evidence of enthusiasm and approval on the part of the vast audience; the applause frequently interrupting the speaker for several moments and, at times, causing the hall to become the scene of the wildest excitement. Few of those who were successful in securing admission, on this occasion, will forget the rounds of applause, the hearty cheers, the clapping of fair hands and the waving of hundreds of snowy handkerchiefs, by which the swarming crowd so often testified its appreciation of Mr. Sumner's scholarly diction, effective eloquence and patriotic, statesmanlike utterance of these great political truths. It is but simple truth to say, that none of the many political meetings of the campaign, in New York, could at all compare with this mass meeting of the flower of our citizenship, whether regard be had to the numbers, intelligence, social position, or sound sentiments of loyalty, which were the characteristics of the great gathering of November 5th, 1864.

NEW YORK YOUNG MEN'S REPUBLICAN UNION.

---

OFFICERS.

MARK HOYT, *President.*

DEXTER A. HAWKINS, *Vice-President.*

FRANK W. BALLARD, *Corresponding Secretary.*

CHARLES T. RODGERS, *Treasurer.*

BOARD OF CONTROL.

CEPHAS BRAINERD, *Chairman.*

MARK HOYT.

DEXTER A. HAWKINS.

FRANK W. BALLARD.

CHARLES T. RODGERS.

GEORGE H. MATHEWS.

BENJAMIN F. MANIERRE.

THOMAS L. THORNELL.

WILLIAM M. FRANKLIN.

CHARLES C. NOTT.

JAMES H. WELSH.

## S P E E C H .

---

FELLOW-CITIZENS :—

In all the concerns of life, the first necessity is to see and comprehend the circumstances about us. Without this knowledge human conduct must fail. Without this knowledge the machine cannot be worked ; the ground cannot be tilled ; the ship cannot be navigated ; war cannot be waged ; government cannot be conducted. The old Greek, suddenly enveloped in a cloud while battling with his enemies, exclaimed, “ Give me to see ; ” but this exclamation of the warrior is the exclamation, also, of every person in practical life, whether striving for his country or only for himself. “ Give me to see, ” that I may comprehend my duty. “ Give me to see, ” that I may recognize my enemy. “ Give me to see, ” that I may know where to strike.

### *Diagnosis Essential.*

The good physician, before any prescription for his patient, endeavors, by a careful diagnosis, to ascertain the nature of the disease or injury, and when this is done, he proceeds with confidence. Without such knowledge all medical skill must fail. You do not forget how it failed in the recent case of the Italian patriot, Garibaldi, suffering cruelly from a wound in the foot—received at the unfortunate battle of Aspramonte—which, for a long time, nobody seemed to understand. Eminent surgeons of different countries were at fault. At last, Nélaton, the liberal professor of the Medical School at Paris, left his pupils and patients and journeyed into Italy to visit the illustrious sufferer. Other surgeons had said that there was no ball lodged in the foot ; the French surgeon, after a careful diagnosis, declared that there was, and at once extracted it. From that time Garibaldi has gained in health and strength, thanks to his scientific visitor, who was enabled to understand his case.

### *Not Party now but Country.*

But nowhere is the diagnosis more important than in national affairs. Men are naturally patriotic. They love their country with instinctive love, quickened at the mother’s knee, and nursed in the earliest teachings of the school. For country they

offer fortune and life. But while thus devoted, they do not always see clearly the line of duty. Local prejudice, personal antipathy and selfish interest obscure the vision. And far beyond all these is the disturbing influence of "party," which acts with all the power of discipline and organization added to numbers. Men attach themselves to a political party as to a religion, and yield blindly to its behests. By an error of judgment, rather than of the heart, they give up to party what was meant for country or mankind. I do not condemn political parties, but simply warn against their tyranny. A patriotic Opposition, watchful of the public service, is hardly less important than a patriotic Administration. They are the complements of each other, and even while in open conflict, unite in duty to their country. But a political party which ceases to be patriotic, which openly takes sides with Rebellion, which sends up "blue lights" as a signal to an armed foe, or which subtly undermines those popular energies that are now needed for the national defence that our country may live—such a party is an engine of frightful evil, to be abhorred "as the gates of hell." It is, unhappily, one of the evils of party always, even in its best estate, that it tends to dominate over its members, so as to create an oligarchical power, a sort of *imperium in imperio*, which may overshadow the government itself. But this influence becomes disastrous beyond measure when bad men obtain control or bad ideas prevail. Then must all who are not ready to forget their country consider carefully the consequences of their conduct. Adherence to party may be next door to treason.

Fellow-citizens, I address you as patriots who love their country and would not willingly see it suffer; who rejoice in its triumphs and long to behold its flag furled in peace. But it is the nature of a true patriotism to love country most when it is most in peril. As dangers thicken and the skies darken, the patriot soul is roused by internal fire so that no sacrifice seems too great. And now, when the national life is assailed by traitors at home, while foreign powers look on with wicked sympathy, I begin by asking that you should forget "party" and all its watchwords. Think only of country.

### *Object of the War.*

There is much misconception, even among well-meaning persons, with regard to the object of the war, while partisans do not tire of misrepresenting it. A plain statement will show the truth as it is.

It is often said that the object of the war on our part is simply to restore the Constitution, and much mystification is employed with regard to the essential limits of such a contest. Mr. Crittenden's resolution, adopted by both Houses of Congress, declared that the war was "not waged on our part in any spirit of oppression, nor for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, nor purpose

*of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of States; but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution and to preserve the Union with all the dignity, equality and rights of the several States unimpaired."* I rejoice to remember that I did not vote for that resolution. It was unsatisfactory to me at the time and is more unsatisfactory now. While plausible in form, it was in the nature of a snare.

Again it is said that the object of the war is to abolish Slavery. This also is a mistake, although it is generally urged by those who seek occasion to criticise the war, and, therefore, it is in the nature of a misrepresentation. At the beginning of the war and during its early stages, Slavery was left untouched in the enjoyment of a peculiar immunity, such as was accorded to no other rebel interest. If this peculiar immunity has been discontinued, it is only because Slavery is at last seen in its true character, and because its absolute identity with the Rebellion has come to be recognized.

Not to restore the Constitution, not to abolish Slavery, do we now go forth to battle. For neither of these. But simply to *put down the Rebellion*. It is this and nothing more. Never in history was there a war where the object was so manifest. If, in the process of putting down the Rebellion, the Constitution shall be completely restored or Slavery shall be completely abolished, the war will still be the same in its essential object.

### *Origin of the War.*

Look at its origin and you will see how its true character appears beyond question. Certain slave-masters, after long years of conspiracy, rose against the Republic and struck at its life. The reason assigned for this parricide was as strange as the deed. It was simply because the people of the United States, by a constitutional majority, according to the forms of law, had elected Abraham Lincoln as President. On this alleged reason, and to defeat his administration, Rebellion was organized. You are familiar with the succession of parricidal blows that ensued. State after State, beginning with South Carolina, always traitorous, undertook to withdraw from the Union. Their Senators and Representatives in Congress actually withdrew from the National Capitol, leaving behind menaces of war. Custom-houses, post-offices, mints, arsenals, forts, — all possessions of the National Government, — one after the other were seized by the rebel slave-masters. As early as 1st of January, 1861, while James Buchanan was President, the palmetto flag was hoisted over the custom-house and post-office at Charleston. It had already been hoisted over Castle Pinckney and Fort Moultrie in the harbor of Charleston, while the national force left in these fortresses surrendered to the rebel slave-masters. This was followed by the seizure of Fort

Pulaski at Savannah, Fort Morgan at Mobile, Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip at New Orleans, Fort Barrancas and Fort McRae, with the navy-yard at Pensacola. Throughout that whole rebel region two fortresses only remained to the National Government. These were Fort Sumter and Fort Pickens. Already the steamer Star of the West, bearing re-enforcements to the small garrison cooped up in Fort Sumter, had been fired at in the harbor of Charleston, and compelled to put back discomfited to New York. All this was war. Meanwhile the rebel States had taken the form of a confederacy, with Slavery as its corner-stone, and had proceeded to organize an immense military force in the service of the Rebellion. At last, after long continued preparations, the rebel batteries opened upon Fort Sumter, which, after a defence of thirty-four hours, was compelled to surrender. There was rejoicing at the rebel capital, and the rebel Secretary of War, addressing an immense audience, let drop words which reveal the true character of the war. "No man," said he, "could tell where the war this day commenced would end, but he would prophecy that the flag which now flaunts the breeze here would float over the old Capitol at Washington before the first of May. Let them try *Southern chivalry* and test the extent of Southern resources, and it might float eventually over Faneuil Hall itself." It was already the 12th April, and the rebel flag was to float over the National Capitol before the 1st of May. Surely it was time that something should be done in self-defence.

Thus far the National Government had done nothing — absolutely nothing. It had received blow after blow ; it had seen its possessions, one after another, wrested from its power ; it had seen State after State assume the front of Rebellion ; it had seen the whole combined in a pseudo-confederacy, with a rebel President, surrounded by a rebel Cabinet and a rebel Congress ; and it had bent under a storm of shot and shell from rebel batteries. At last it spoke, calling the country to arms. Search history, and you can find no instance of equal audacity on the part of rebels, and no instance of equal forbearance on the part of government.

### *War of Self-Defence.*

The country was called to arms. Nobody can forget that day when the people everywhere, inspired by patriotic ardor, rose in *necessary self-defence* to save the national Capitol and Faneuil Hall already menaced. The war for the Rebellion had begun long before ; but it began for the country at that great uprising, when all seemed filled with one generous purpose and nobody hesitated. Men calling themselves Democrats vied with Republicans. Daniel S. Dickinson and Benjamin F. Butler made haste to join their country. Party differences were all forgotten as the tocsin sounded.

It was the tocsin summoning the country to defend itself. The war then and there recognized, was, on our part, a war of national defence, and its simple object was to put down the Rebellion. You confuse yourself if you say, that it was to restore the Constitution, and you misrepresent the fact if you say that it was to abolish Slavery. It was for the suppression of the Rebellion ; nor more, nor less.

^ *The Rebellion and Slavery one and the same.*

Here, then, fellow-citizens, it becomes important to know and comprehend the Rebellion, and especially its animating impulse, or soul. Its diagnosis has, from the beginning, been essential to the right conduct of the war ; and if, at any time, the war has seemed to fail, or foreign powers have seemed to lower, it is because our government has not recognized the true character of the Rebellion. "Give me to see," is the exclamation of every patriot, that our blows may not fail. It was obvious, at once, to all familiar with history, that this Rebellion stood out in bad eminence, unlike any other of which we have authentic record on earth ; that it was not a dynastic struggle, as in the adventurous expeditions of the British Pretender ; that it was not a religious struggle, as in the French wars of the League ; that it was not a struggle against a conqueror, as in the repeated outbreaks of Ireland ; that it was not a struggle for freedom, like that of Switzerland against Austria, of Holland against Spain, of our fathers against England, of the Spanish American States against Spain, and of Greece against Turkey ; but that it had in it none of these elements, whether dynasty, religion or freedom, for it was simply a struggle for Slavery ; and so completely had Slavery entered into and possessed it, that the Rebellion was changed to itself. If you would find a parallel to this transcendent wickedness, you must pass "the flaming bounds of space and time" and look on that earliest Rebellion, when Satan strove against the Almighty Throne, to establish the supremacy of Sin, even as now this insensate Rebellion strives to establish the supremacy of Slavery. It is because partisans have failed to see the true character of the Rebellion, or been unwilling to recognize it, that they have not felt how absurd it was to say that the war on our part has been changed, when nothing has been done but to recognize the identity between Slavery and the Rebellion. There has been no change. It is still a war to put down the Rebellion ; but we are in earnest, and are determined that the Rebellion shall not save itself by skulking under the *alias* of Slavery. Call it Rebellion or call it Slavery, it is one and the same.

*Two elemental forces, Slavery and Liberty, face to face.*

A glance, only, at the immediate origin of this war is enough for the present occasion. But, in order to dispel all darkness and to determine our duty, let me take you for a few moments back to the distant origin of the two elemental forces, which are now in deadly conflict.

Looking at the question abstractly these two elemental forces are nothing but Slavery and Liberty. It is almost superfluous to add that these are natural enemies, and cannot exist together. Where Slavery is there Liberty cannot be ; and where Liberty is there Slavery cannot be. To uphold Slavery, there must be an uncompromising denial of Liberty ; to uphold Liberty there must be an uncompromising denial of Slavery. Each in self-defence must stifle the other. Therefore between the two there is constant hostility and undying hate. This eternal warfare is not peculiar to our country. It belongs to the nature of universal man. If it fails to show itself anywhere, it is because Slavery has won its most detestable triumph, and blotted out the Heaven-born sentiment of freedom. Circumstances among us, going back to our earliest history, have given unprecedented activity to these two incompatible principles, and have at last brought them into bloody battle, face to face. But it is only a part of the universal conflict which must endure so long as a single slave shall wear a chain. Slavery itself is *a state of war*, ready to burst forth in blood whenever the slave reclaims that liberty which is his right, or whenever mankind refuses to sanction its inhuman pretensions.

*The Slave-Ship, and the May-Flower in 1620.*

Go back to the earliest days of colonial history, and you will find the conflict already preparing. It was in 1620, that nineteen slaves were landed at Jamestown in Virginia — the first that ever pressed the soil of our country. In that same year the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth. Those two cargoes contained the hostile germs, which have ripened in our time. They fitly symbolize our gigantic strife. On the one side is the slave-ship, and on the other is the May-Flower. Early events derive importance as we learn to recognize their undoubted consequences, and these two ships may be regarded hereafter with additional interest when it is seen that in them were the beginnings of the present war.

Perhaps in all the romantic legends of the sea, there is nothing more striking than the contrast presented by these two vessels. Each had ventured forth upon an untried and perilous ocean to find an unknown and distant coast. In this they were alike ; but in all else how unlike ! One was freighted with human beings forcibly torn from their own country, and hurried away in chains to be sold as slaves. The other was filled with good men, who had vol-

untarily turned their backs upon their own country, to seek other homes, where at least they might be free. One was heavy with curses and with sorrow. The other was lifted with anthem and with prayer. And thus, at the same time, beneath the same sun, over the same waves, they found their way. It requiers no effort of imagination to see on board one of those ships Slavery, and on board of the other Liberty, traversing the ocean to continue here on this broad continent their immitigable war.

There is no record of what passed in the cabin of the slave-ship, before the landing of the slaves. The wail of Slavery, the clank of chains, and the voice of the master counting the price of his cargo, there must have been. But the cabin of the May-Flower witnessed another scene, of which there is an authentic record, as the whole company, by solemn compact, deliberately constituted themselves a body politic, and set the grand example of a Christian Commonwealth, thus indicating the character which had been claimed for them, as "knit together in a strict and sacred bond by virtue of which they held themselves bound to take care of the good of each other and of the whole." And so these two voyages closed.

*Influence of the two Ships.*

Look at the early social life of the two warring sections, and you will see the influence of these two ships. Virginia continued to be supplied with slaves, so that Slavery became a part of herself. On the other hand, New England always set her face against Slavery. To her great honor, in an age when Slavery was less condemned than now, the legislature of Massachusetts censured a ship-master who had "fraudulently and injuriously brought a negro from Guinea," and, by solemn vote, resolved that the negro should be "sent back without delay;" and not long after enacted the law of Exodus, "If any man stealeth a man, he shall surely be put to death." Thus at that early day stood Virginia and New England; for such at that time was the designation of the two provinces which divided British America by a line of demarkation very nearly coincident with the recent slave line of our Republic.

*Opposite Character of the Settlers of Virginia and New England.*

But the contrast between the two colonies, as illustrated by these two voyages, appears equally in the opposite character of their respective settlers. Like seeks like, and the Pilgrims of the May-Flower were followed by others of similar virtues,—whose first labors on landing were to build churches and schools. Many of them had the best education of England; some were men of substance, and there was no poverty among them that could cause a blush, while all were most exact and exemplary in conduct. They were a branch from that grand Puritan stock, to which,

according to the reluctant confession of Hume, "the English were indebted for the whole freedom of their Constitution." We are told by Burke that there is a sacred veil to be drawn over the beginnings of all governments, and that where this is not happily supplied by time, it must be found in a discreet silence. But no veil is needed for the Puritan settlers of New England. It is very different with the early settlers of Virginia, recruited from the castaways and shirks of Old England, and mostly needy men, of desperate fortunes and dissolute lives, who cared nothing for churches or schools. Such people naturally became slave-masters. I should not lift the veil which charity would kindly draw over those early settlers, if a just knowledge of their character had not become important in illustrating the origin of our troubles.

*Absurd pretence that Virginia was settled by Cavaliers.*

It is a common boast of our slave-masters that they constitute a modern "chivalry," derived from the "cavaliers" of England and reinforced by the ennobling influences of African Slavery. This boast has been so often repeated, that it has obtained a certain acceptance among those not familiar with our early history, and even well-informed persons have allowed themselves to say that the conflict in which we are now engaged is a continuance of the old war between the Cavaliers and the Roundheads. So far as it is intended to say that the war is a part of the ever-recurring conflict between Slavery and Liberty, there can be no objection to this illustration. But if it be intended to say that the rebels are "cavaliers," or the descendants of cavaliers, there is just ground of objection. I know not if the armies of the Union, now fighting the world's greatest battle for Human Rights, may not be called Roundheads; but I am sure that the rebels, now fighting for Slavery, cannot be called "cavaliers" in any sense. They are not so in character, as their barbarism attests. And they are as little so historically.

The whole pretension is a preposterous absurdity by which the country has been already too much deceived. It is not creditable to the general intelligence that such a folly should be allowed to play such a part. Unquestionably there were settlers in Virginia, as there were also in New England, connected with aristocratic families. But they were so few in each colony as not to modify essentially the prevailing population, which took its character from the mass rather than from any individual. The origin of Virginia is so well authenticated as to leave little doubt with regard to the character of its population, unless you reject all the concurrent testimony of contemporaries and all the concurrent admissions of historians. Perhaps there is nothing in our early history with regard to which the authorities are so various and so clear. From their very abundance, it is difficult to choose.

*True character of Settlers of Virginia.*

I begin with the early patron of Virginia, Lord Delaware, who after visiting the colony described the people there in a letter dated at Jamestown, July 7, 1610, as "men of distempered bodies and infected minds, whom no examples daily before their eyes, either of goodness or punishment, can deter from their habitual impieties or terrify from a shameful death." [Strachey's *History*. *Preface*, p. 32.] Language cannot be stronger.

But the colony, which began with bad men, was increased by worse. In 1619, king James wrote to the Virginia Company, commanding them "to send a hundred dissolute persons to Virginia, whom the knight marshal shall deliver." [Strachey's *History of Virginia*. Vol. 1, p. 168.] Thus by royal command was this colony made a Botany Bay.

The company, not content with the "hundred dissolute persons" supplied by the king's order, entreated for more, until Captain John Smith, the hero of Virginia, was moved to express his disgust. He testifies to the evil when he wrote in 1622: "Since I came from thence, the honorable company have been humble suitors to his majesty to get vagabond and condemned men to go thither; nay, so much scorned was the name of Virginia, *some did choose to be hanged ere they would go thither, and were.*" [Smith's *New England Trials*, 1622.] This was bad enough.

But the Virginia Company seem to have been insensible to the shame of such a settlement. Its agents and orators vindicated the utility of the colony on this account. In a work entitled "*Nova Britannia*, offering most excellent fruits by planting in Virginia," published in London in 1609 and dedicated to "one of his majesty's council for Virginia," it was openly argued, that unless "swarms of idle persons in lewd and naughty practices" were sent abroad "we must provide shortly *more prisons and corrections* for their bad conditions;" and that it was "most profitable for our state to rid our multitudes of such as lie at home, pestering the land with pestilence and penury and infecting one another with vice and villany, worse than the plague itself." Dr. Donne, dean of St. Paul's, poet also, in a sermon "preached to the Honorable Company of the Virginian Plantation 13th November, 1622," thus sets forth the merits of the colony: "The plantation shall redeem many a wretch from the laws of death; from the hands of the executioner. It shall sweep your streets and wash your doors from idle persons, and the children of idle persons, and employ them." Such were the puffs by which recruits were gained for Virginia.

History records the unquestionable result, and here the authorities multiply. Sir Jonathan Child, in his "Discourse of the Trade of the Plantations," published in 1698 says: "Virginia

and Barbadoes were *first peopled* by a sort of loose vagrant people. Had it not been for our plantations, they must have come to be *hanged or starved*, or sold for soldiers." Dr. Douglass, in his Colonial History, printed in 1749, gives the following testimony: "Our plantations in America, *New England excepted*, have been generally settled: 1. By malcontents from the administrations from time to time. 2. By fraudulent debtors as a refuge from creditors; and 3, by convicts or criminals who chose transportation rather than death." [*Douglass' History*, Vol. 2, p. 428.] Graham, the Scotch historian, who has written so conscientiously of our country, speaking of the first settlers, says of Virginia: "A great proportion of these new emigrants, consisted of profligate and licentious youths, sent from England by their friends, with the hope of changing their destinies, or for the purpose of screening them from the justice or contempt of their country; \* \* \* with others like these, more likely to corrupt and prey upon an infant commonwealth than to foster it." [*Graham, United States*, Vol. 1, p. 54.] The historian of Virginia, William Stith, whose work was published at Williamsburg in the last century, is not less explicit: "I cannot but remark," he says, "how early that custom arose of transporting loose and dissolute persons to Virginia, as a place of punishment and disgrace, which although originally designed for the advancement and increase of the colony, yet has certainly proved a great prejudice and hindrance to its growth; for it hath laid one of the finest countries of British America under the unjust scandal of being *a mere hell upon earth*, another Siberia, and only fit for the reception of malefactors and the vilest of the people; so that few, at least few large bodies of people have been induced willingly to transport themselves to such a place, and our younger sisters the northern colonies, have profited thereby." [*Stith's History of Virginia*, Vol. 1, p. 168.] But this is not all. Another historian of Virginia of our own day, whose work was published at Richmond, in 1846, while showing that pride in his State which would change every settler into a "cavalier," has been compelled to make the following most rueful confession: "Gentlemen reduced to poverty by gaming and extravagance, too proud to beg, too lazy to dig — broken tradesmen with some stigma of fraud yet clinging to their names — footmen, who had expended in the mother country the last shred of honest reputation that was ever held — rakes consumed with disease and shattered in the service of impurity — libertines whose race of sin was yet to run — and unruly sparks packed off by their friends to escape worse destinies at home — these were the men who came to aid in founding a nation and to transmit to posterity their own immaculate impress." [*Howison, History of Virginia*, Vol. 1, p. 169.] And this same historian confesses that social life in Virginia, begin-

ning in such baseness, after more than a century, had developed "an aristocracy neither of talent, nor learning, nor moral worth, but of land and slave interest." [Ibid, Vol. 2, p. 201.] So much for the testimony of history, even when written and printed in Virginia.

I know not the number of desperate persons shipped to Virginia; but there were enough to leave an indelible impression on the colony, and to give it a name in the literature of the time. It was this colony which suggested to Bacon the most pregnant words of one of his Essays; which furnished to DeFoe several striking passages in one of his romances; and which provoked Massinger to a dialogue in one of his dramas. Let me glance for one moment at these illustrations.

It is in the Essay on "Plantations," that Bacon thus brands the early settlement of Virginia: "It is a shameful and unblessed thing to take the *scum of people and wicked condemned men* to be the people with whom you plant; and not only so but it *spoileth the plantation*, for they will ever live like rogues." [Bacon's *Essays*, 33.] Surely there is nothing here out of which to construct a "cavalier."

In the narrative of Moll Flanders, the author of *Robinson Crusoe*, who gives to all his sketches such lifelike character that they seem to be sun-pictures, exhibits this same colony. Here is a glimpse: "The greater part of the inhabitants were of two sorts, 1st, such as were brought over by the masters of the ships to be sold as servants; 2d, such as were transported, after having been found guilty of crimes punishable with death. When they come here we make no difference; the planters buy them, and they work together in the field till their time is out. \* \* \* Hence many a Newgate-bird becomes a great man. We have several justices of the peace, officers of the trained bands and magistrates of the town they live in, that have been burnt in the hand. \* \* \* Some of the best men in the country are burnt in the hand, and are not ashamed to own it. There's Major —, he was an eminent pickpocket; there's Justice Ba—r, he was a shoplifter. Both of them were burned in the hand, and I could name you several such as they are." [Fortunes and Misfortunes of the Famous Moll Flanders, p. 88.] Nothing is said here of "cavaliers."

I have referred to Massinger. Here is a curious bit from one of the grave comedies of that poet dramatist.

"*Luke*. It is but to Virginia.

*Lady Frugal*. How! Virginia!

High Heaven forbid! Remember, sir, I beseech you,  
What creatures are shipped thither.

*Anne*. Condemned wretches,  
Forfeited to the law;  
For the abomination of their life,  
Spewed out of their own country."

*The City Madam. Act V, sc. 1.*

Thus from every quarter the testimony accumulates. And yet we are constantly told that Virginia was settled by "cavaliers."

*Early Settlers of South Carolina.*

The territory now occupied by South Carolina originally constituted a part of Virginia. It was out of Virginia that it was carved into a separate colony. Although differing in some respects, the populations seem to have been kindred in character. Ramsay, the historian of the State, in a work published at Charleston, in 1809, says that, "the emigrants were a medley of different nations and principles," and that among them were persons "who took refuge from the powers of fortune and the rigor of creditors;" "young men, reduced to misery by folly and excess;" and "restless spirits, fond of roving." To these were added Huguenots, driven from France by the revocation of the edict of Nantes. [Ramsay's *History of South Carolina*, p. 2, 3, 5.] But Graham tells us that, "not a trace of the existence of an order of clergymen is to be found in the laws of Carolina during the first twenty years of its history." [History of United States. Vol. 2, p. 83.] And another historian says that, "the inhabitants, far from living in friendship and harmony among themselves, were seditious and ungovernable." [Hewitt's *History of South Carolina*. Vol. 1, p. 104.] Such a people were naturally insensible to moral distinctions, so that, according to Hewitt, "pirates were treated with great civility and friendship," and, "by bribery and corruption, they often found favor with the provincial juries, and by this means escaped the hands of justice." All of which is declared by the historian to be "evidences of the licentious spirit which prevailed in the colony." [Ibid, pp. 92, 115.] Graham uses still stronger language, when he says, "the governor, the proprietors, deputies and the principal inhabitants, degraded themselves to a level with the vilest of mankind, by abetting the crimes of pirates and becoming receivers of their nefarious acquisitions." [History of United States. Vol. 2, p. 121.) Such is the testimony with regard to South Carolina. To call such a people "cavaliers," is an abuse of terms.

*The "Cavalier" pretension dismissed to contempt.*

I hope that I have not taken too much time in exposing a vain-glorious pretension, which has helped to give the Rebellion a character of respectability it does not deserve. I dismiss it to general contempt, as one of the lies by which Slavery, the greatest lie of all, has been recommended to weak persons who could be deceived by names. But you will not fail to remark how naturally Slavery flourished among such a congenial people. Convicts and wretches who had set at naught all rights of property and all decency, were the very people to set up the revolting pretension of "property in man."

*Conflict between Slavery and Liberty.*

I come back to the postulate with which I began, that the present war is simply a conflict between Slavery and Liberty. This is a plain statement, which will defy contradiction. To my mind it is more satisfactory than that other statement, which is often made, that it is a conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy. This in a certain sense is true; but from its generality it is less effective than a more precise and restricted statement. It does not disclose the whole truth; for it does not exhibit the unique and exceptional character of the pretension which we combat. For centuries there has been a conflict between Aristocracy and Democracy, or, in other words, the few on one side have been perpetually striving to rule and oppress the many. But now for the first time in the world's annals a people professing civilization has commenced war to uphold the intolerable pretension *to compel labor without wages*, and that most disgusting incident, the whipping of women and the selling of children. Call these pretenders aristocrats or oligarchs if you will; but do not forget that their aristocracy or oligarchy is the least respectable of any ever attempted, and is so entirely modern that it is antedated by the Durham bull Hubbuck, the short-horn progenitor of the oligarchy of cattle, and by the stallion Godolphin, the Arabian progenitor of the oligarchy of horses, both of which may be traced to the middle of the last century. And do not forget that, if you would find a prototype in brutality, you must turn your back upon civilized history, and repair to those distant islands which witnessed an oligarchy of cannibals, or go to barbarous Africa, which has been kept in barbarism by an oligarchy of men-stealers.

*Liberty throughout the World.*

Thus it stands. The conflict is directly between Slavery and Liberty. But because Slavery aims at the life of the Republic, the conflict involves our national existence; and because our national death would be the despair of Liberty everywhere, it involves this great cause throughout the world. And yet I would not for one moment lose sight of the special enemy; for our energies can be properly directed only when we are able to confront him. "Give me to see," said the old Greek; and this must be our exclamation now.

*Slavery a Disturber always.*

Slavery, from the beginning, has been a disturber, and it is now a red-handed traitor. I do not travel back before the Revolution; but starting from that great event, I show you Slavery always offensive, and forever thrusting itself in the path of national peace and honor. The Declaration of Independence, as originally prepared by Jefferson, contained a vigorous passage denounc-

ing king George for his patronage of the slave-trade. The slave-masters insisted upon striking it out, and it was struck out; and here was their first victory. At the adoption of the Federal Constitution they insisted upon the recognition of the slave-trade as the condition of Union; and here was another victory. In the earliest Congress, under the Constitution, they commenced the menace of disunion, and this menace was continued at every turn of public affairs, especially at every proposition or even petition touching Slavery, until it triumphed signally in that atrocious Fugitive Slave Bill, which made all the Free States a hunting ground for slaves. Throughout these contests Slavery was vulgar, brutal, savage, while its braggart orators and chaplains heralded its claims. Hogarth, in his famous picture of Bruin, painted Slavery when he portrayed an immense grizzly bear hugging, as if he loved it, an enormous gnarled bludgeon, with a brand of infamy labelled on every knot, such as *Lie Twelve*, *Lie Fifteen*, and about his throat a clerical band, torn, crumpled and awry. In the States where it flourished, speech and press were both despoiled of their freedom, and the whole country seemed to be fast sinking under its degrading tyranny. Everything in science, or history, or church, or state, was bent to its support. There was a new political economy, which taught the superiority of slave labor; a new ethnology, which excluded the slave from the family of man; a new heraldry, which admitted the slave-master to the list of nobles; a new morality, which vindicated the rightfulness of Slavery; a new religion, which recognised Slavery as a missionary enterprise; a new theodicy, which placed Slavery under the sanctions of divine benevolence; and a new Constitution, which installed Slavery in the very citadel of our liberties. By such strange inventions the giant felony fortified itself. At last it struck at the pioneers of Liberty in Kansas. There was its first battle. The next was when it took up arms against the National Government and rallied all its forces in bloody rebellion. Thus is this Rebellion, by unquestionable pedigree, derived from Slavery, and the parent lives in the offspring.

*Rebellion is Belligerent Slavery.*

Therefore, if you are in earnest against the Rebellion, you must be in earnest, also, against Slavery; for the two are synonymous or convertible terms. The Rebellion is nothing but Slavery in arms. It is Slavery on horseback. It is belligerent Slavery.

*To save the Country, we must strike at Slavery.*

It is, when we see the Rebellion *as it is*, in its true light, face to face, that we see our whole duty. Then must the patriot, whatever may have been his personal prejudices or party associations, insist, at all hazards, that Slavery shall not be suffered to escape

from that righteous judgment which is the doom of the Rebellion. No false tenderness, no casuistry of politics must intrude to save it anywhere; for you cannot save Slavery anywhere without just to that extent saving the Rebellion. Show me anywhere a sympathizer with Slavery and I will show you a sympathizer with the Rebellion.

Our duty is clear. In the sacred service of patriotism nothing can be allowed to stand in the way. Fortress, camp, citadel, each and all must be overcome; but the animating soul of every fortress, camp or citadel throughout the Rebellion is Slavery. Surely, when the country is in danger, there can be no hesitation. And as the greater contains the less, so this greatest charity of country embraces for the time all other charities.

There is another advantage in striking at Slavery, which must not be forgotten. Such a blow is in strict obedience to the laws of nature, and we are reminded by the great master of thought, Lord Bacon, that only through such obedience can victory be won — *vincit parendo*. It is in conformity, also, with all the attributes of God, so that his Almighty Arm will give strength to the blow. Thus do we bring our efforts at once in harmony with the sublime laws, physical and moral, which govern the universe, while every good influence, every breath of Heaven and every prayer of man is on our side. We also bring ourselves in harmony with our own Declaration of Independence, so that all its early promises become a living letter, and our country is at last saved from that practical inconsistency which has been a heavy burden in her history.

### *Proposed Surrender to Slavery.*

To do all this seems so natural and so entirely according to the dictates of patriotism, that we may well be astonished that it should meet opposition. But there is a wide-spread political party, which, true to its history, now comes forward to save belligerent Slavery at this last moment, when it is about to be trampled out forever. Not to save the country but to save belligerent Slavery is the object of the mis-named Democracy. Asserting the war, in which so much has been done, to be a failure; forgetting the vast spaces it has already reclaimed, the rivers it has opened, the ports it has secured and the people it has redeemed; handing over to contempt the officers and men, living and dead, who have waged its innumerable battles,—this political party openly proposes surrender to the Rebellion. I do not use too strong language. It is actual surrender and capitulation that is proposed, in one of two forms,—(1) either by acknowledging the Rebel States, so that they shall be treated as independent, or (2) by acknowledging Slavery, so that it shall be restored to its old supremacy over the National Government, with additional

guarantees. The different schemes of opposition are all contained in one or the other of these two propositions.

*Two Propositions of Surrender.*

If we examine these two propositions we shall find them equally flagitious and impracticable. Both allow the country to be sacrificed for the sake of Slavery; one, by breaking the Union in pieces that a new Slave Power may be created, and the other by continuing the Union that the old Slave Power may enjoy its sway and masterdom. Both pivot on Slavery. One acknowledges the Slave Power *out of the Union*; the other acknowledges the Slave Power *in the Union*.

Glance, if you please, at these two different forms of surrender.

*Surrender by Acknowledging the Rebel States.*

I. And, *first, of surrender by acknowledging the Rebel States*, so that they shall be independent. How futile to think that there can be any consent to the establishment of a Slave Power carved out of our Republic. Such a surrender would begin in shame; but it would also begin, continue and end in troubles and sorrows which no imagination can picture.

*Abandonment of Unionists and Slaves in Rebel States impossible.*

(1.) I do not dwell on the shame that would cover our Republic, but I ask, on the threshold, how you would feel in abandoning to the tender mercies of the Rebellion all those who, from sentiment or conviction or condition, now look to the National Government as a deliverer. This topic has not, it seems to me, been sufficiently impressed upon the country. Would that I could make it sink deep into your souls. There are the Unionists shut up within the confines of the Rebellion, and unable to help themselves. They can do nothing, not even cry out, until the military power of the Rebellion is crushed. Let this be done; let the rebel grip be unloosed, and you will hear their voices, as joyously and reverently they hail the national flag. And there are the slaves, also, to whom the Rebellion is an immense, deep-moated, thick-walled, heavy-bolted Bastile, where a whole race is blinded, manacled and outraged. But these, again, are powerless so long as rebel sentinels keep watch and ward over them. To these two classes in the rebel States we have from the beginning owed a solemn duty, which can be performed only by perseverance to the end. The patriot Unionists, who have kept their loyalty in solitude and privation, like the early Christians concealed in catacombs, and the slaves, also, who have been compelled to serve their cruel task-masters, must not be sacrificed.

Perhaps there is no character in which the National Government may more truly exult than that of Deliverer. Rarely in

history has such a duty, with its attendant glory, been so clearly imposed. The piety of the early ages found vent in the Crusades, those wonderful enterprises of valor and of travel, which exercised such a transforming influence over modern civilization. But our war is not less important. It is a crusade, not to deliver the tomb, but to deliver the living temples of the Lord, and it is destined to exercise a transforming influence beyond any crusade in history.

*A Boundary Line impossible.*

(2.) But if you agree to abandon the patriots and the slaves in the rebel States, you will only begin your infinite difficulties. How will you determine the boundary line which is to cleave this continent in twain? Where shall the god Terminus be allowed to plant his altar? What States shall be left at the North in the light of Liberty? What States shall be consigned to the gloom of Slavery? Surely no swiftness to surrender can make you surrender Maryland, now redeemed by the votes of citizen soldiers; nor West Virginia, admitted as a Free State into the Union; nor Missouri, which has been made the dark and bloody ground. And how about Kentucky, Tennessee, and Louisiana? There also is the Mississippi, now once more free from its fountains to the sea. Surely this mighty river will not again be compelled to wear chains.

These inquiries simply open the difficulties to be encountered in this endeavor. If there were any natural boundary, constituting in itself a barrier and an altar, or if during long generations any Chinese wall had been built for fifteen hundred miles across the continent, then perhaps there might be a dividing line. But nature and history, by solemn decrees, have fixed it otherwise, and have marked this broad land from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, for one Country, with one Liberty, one Constitution, and one Destiny.

*Terms or Conditions of Peace impossible.*

(3.) But if the boundary line is settled, then will arise the many-headed question of terms and conditions. On what terms and conditions can peace be stipulated? The exulting rebels, whose new empire is founded on the corner-stone of Slavery, will naturally exact promises for the rendition of fugitive slaves. Are you, who have just emancipated yourselves from this obligation, ready to renew it, and to repeat again an inexpiable crime? But, if you do not, how can you expect peace? Then, it will remain to determine the commercial relations between the two separate governments, with rights of transit and travel. If you think that rebels, flushed with success, and scorning their defeated opponents, will come to any practical terms—any terms which

will not leave our commerce and all who are engaged in it exposed to outrage—you place a trust in their moderation which circumstances thus far do not justify. The whole idea is little better than an excursion to the moon, in a car drawn by geese, as described by the Spanish poet.

Long before the war, and especially in the discussions which preceded it, these rebels were fiery and most unscrupulous. War has not made them less so. The moral sense which they wanted when it began has not been enkindled since. With such a people there is no chance of terms and conditions, except according to their lawless will. The first surrender on our part will be the signal to a long line of surrenders, each of which will be a catastrophe. Nothing will be too unreasonable or grinding. If our own national debt is not repudiated, theirs at least must be assumed.

*Peace after Recognition impossible.*

(4.) But suppose the shameful sacrifice consummated, the impossible boundaries adjusted, and the illusive terms and conditions stipulated, do you imagine that you have obtained peace? Alas! no. Nothing of the sort. You may call it peace; but it will be war in disguise, ready to break forth in perpetual, chronic, bloody battle. Such an extended inland border, over which Slavery and Liberty will scowl at each other, will be a constant temptation not only to enterprises of smuggling, but to hostile incursions, so that our country will be obliged to sleep on its arms, ready to spring forward in self-defence. Every frontier town will be a St. Albans. Military preparations, absorbing the resources of the people, will become permanent instead of temporary, and the arts of peace will yield to the arts of war. The national character will be changed, and this hospitable continent, instead of being the prosperous home of the poor and friendless, thronging from the Old World, will become a repulsive scene of confusion and strife, while “each new day a gash is added to her wounds.”

Have we not war enough now? Are you so enamored of funerals, where the order of nature is reversed, and parents follow their children to the grave, that you are willing to keep a constant carnival for death? Oh! no. You all desire peace. But there is only one way to secure it. You must so conduct the present war that when once ended there shall be no remaining element of discord, no surviving principle of battle, out of which future war can spring. Above all belligerent Slavery must not be allowed to rear its crest, as an independent Power.

*Disunion by Recognition is General Anarchy.*

(5.) But there is another consequence which must not be omitted. War would not be confined to the two governments representing respectively the two hostile principles, Slavery and Lib-

erty. It would rage with internecine fury among ourselves. Admit that States may fly out of the Union and where will you stop? Other States may follow, it may be in groups, or it may be singly, until our mighty galaxy is broken into separate stars or dissolved into the nebular compost of a people without form or name. Where, then, is country? Where, then, will be those powerful States, which are now the pride of civilization and the hope of mankind? Handed over to ungovernable frenzy, without check or control, until anarchy and chaos are supreme—as with the horses of the murdered Duncan, which, at the assassination of their master,

"Beauteous and swift, the minions of their race,  
Turned wild in nature, broke their stalls, flung out,  
Contending 'gainst obedience, as they would  
Make war with mankind.  
'Tis said, they eat each other."

The picture is terrible; but it hardly exaggerates the fearful disorder. Already our European enemies, looking to their desires for inspiration, predict a general discord. Sometimes it is said that there are to be four or five new nations; that the North-West is to be a nation by itself; the Middle States another; the Pacific States another, and our New England States still another, so that rebel Slavery will be the predominant Power on this continent. But it is useless to speculate on the number of these fractional governments. If disunion is allowed to begin it cannot be stopped. Misrule and confusion will be everywhere. Our fathers saw this at the adoption of the National Constitution, when, in a rude sketch of the time, they pictured the thirteen States as so many staves, which were bound by the hoops into a barrel. Let a single stave be taken out, and the whole barrel falls to pieces. It is easy to see how this must occur with States. The triumph of the Rebellion will be not only the triumph of belligerent Slavery; but it will be also the triumph of State Rights, to this extent, first, that any State, in the exercise of its own lawless will, may abandon its place in the Union, and secondly, that the constitutional verdict of the majority, as in the election of Abraham Lincoln, is not binding. With these two rules of conduct, in conformity with which the Rebellion was organized, there can be no limit to disunion. Therefore, when you consent to the independence of the rebel States, you disband the whole company of States, and blot our country from the map of the world.

*Surrender by acknowledging Slavery.*

II. I have said enough of surrender by the recognition of the Slave States, or in other words of the Slave Power *out of the Union*. It remains now that I should ask your attention to that other form of surrender which proposes the *recognition of the*

*Slave Power in the Union.* Each is surrender. The first, as we have already seen, abandons a part of the Union to the Slave Power ; the other subjects the whole Union to the Slave Power.

It is proposed that the rebel States should be tempted to lay down their arms by a recognition of Slavery in the Union, with new guarantees and assurances of protection. *Slavery cannot exist in any country which it does not govern.* Therefore, we are to ask the rebel slave-masters to come back and consent to govern us. Such in plain terms is the surrender proposed. For one, I will never consent to any such intolerable rule.

But the whole proposition is not less pernicious than that other form of surrender ; nor is it less shameful. It is insulting to reason, and offensive to good morals.

*Impossible, because it is a Compromise.*

(1.) I say nothing of the ignominy it would bring upon the country ; but call attention at once to its character as a Compromise. In the dreary annals of Slavery it is by Compromise that the slave-masters have succeeded in warding off the blows of Liberty. It was a compromise by which that early condemnation of the slave-trade was excluded from the Declaration of Independence ; it was a compromise which surrounded the slave-trade with protection in the National Constitution ; it was a compromise which secured the admission of Missouri as a slave State ; and, (without stopping to complete the list, it is enough to say that) it was a compromise by which the atrocious Fugitive Slave Bill was fastened upon the country, and the Slave Power was installed in the National Government. And now, after the overthrow of the Slave Power at the ballot-box, followed by years of cruel war, another compromise, greatest of all, is proposed, by which belligerent Slavery, dripping with the blood of our murdered fellow-citizens, shall be welcomed to more than its ancient supremacy. (Where is national honor that the criminal pettifoggers are not at once repudiated ? Where is national virtue that such a surrender should be proposed.)

( This proposition is as specious in form as baleful in substance. It is said that the rebel slave-masters should have their " rights under the Constitution." To this plausible language is added the phrase, " the Constitution as it is." All this means Slavery and nothing else. It is for Slavery that men resort to this odious duplicity. Thank God ! the game is understood.)

*Impossible, because Slavery has fallen, legally and constitutionally.*

(2.) But any compromise which shall recognize Slavery in the rebel States is impossible, (even if you were disposed to accept it.) Slavery by the very act of rebellion, ceased to exist, (legally or constitutionally.) It ceased to exist (according to principles of

public law, and also according to a just interpretation of the Constitution;) and having once ceased to exist it cannot be revived.

When I say that it ceased to exist *legally*, I found myself on an unquestionable principle of public law, that Slavery is a peculiar local institution, without any origin in natural right, and deriving its support exclusively from the local government; but if this be true—and it cannot be denied—then Slavery must have fallen with that local government.

When I say that it ceased to exist *constitutionally*, I found myself on the principle that Slavery is of such a character that it cannot exist within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Constitution, as for instance in the National territories, and that therefore, it died constitutionally when, through the disappearance of the local government, it fell within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Constitution.

The consequences of these two principles are most important. Taken in conjunction with the rule, that “once free always free,” they illustrate the impossibility of any surrender to belligerent Slavery *in the Union*.

*Impossible, on account of Proclamation of Emancipation.*

(3.) If, in the zeal of surrender, you reject solemn principles of public law and Constitution, then let me remind you of the Proclamation of Emancipation, where the President, by virtue of the power vested in him as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, ordered that the slaves in the rebel States, “are and henceforward shall be free,” and the Executive Government, including the military and naval authorities, are pledged to “recognize and maintain the freedom of such persons.” By the terms of this instrument, it is applicable to all the slaves in the rebel States; not merely to those within the military lines of the United States; but to all. Even if the President were not bound in simple honesty to maintain this Proclamation to the letter, he has not the power to undo it. He may make a freeman, but he cannot make a slave. Therefore he must reject all surrender, inconsistent with this Act of Emancipation.

It is sometimes said that the Court will set aside the Proclamation. Do not believe it. The Court will do no such thing. It will recognize this act precisely as it recognizes other political and military acts, without presuming to interpose any unconstitutional *veto*, and it will recognize it to the full extent, as it was intended, according to its letter, so that every slave in the rebel States will be free. But even if courts should hesitate, there can be no hesitation with the President or with the country, bound in sacred honor to the freedom of every slave in the rebel States. Therefore, against every effort of surrender, the Proclamation presents an insuperable barrier.

*Impossible, because it would not bring Peace.*

(4.) But if you are willing to descend to the unutterable degradation of renouncing the Proclamation, then in the name of peace, do I protest against any such surrender. So long as Slavery exists in the Union, there can be no peace. The fires which seem to be extinguished will only be covered by treacherous ashes, out of which another conflagration may spring to wrap the country in war. This must not be.

It is because Slavery is not understood, that people are willing to tolerate it. See it as it is, and there can be no question. Slavery has in it all common crimes. The slave-master is burglar, for by night he enters forcibly into the house of another ; he is highway robber, for he stops another on the road, and compels him to surrender his purse ; he is pickpocket, for he picks the pocket of his slave ; he is sneak, for there is no pettiness of petty larceny which he does not employ ; he is horse-stealer, for he takes from his slave the horse that is his ; he is adulterer, for he takes from the slave the wife that is his ; he is the receiver of stolen goods on the grandest scale, for the human being that has been stolen from Africa, he foolishly calls his own. When I describe a slave-master, it is simply as he describes himself in the law which he sanctions. All crime is in Slavery, and so every criminal is reproduced in the slave-master. And yet it is proposed to give to this whole class not only new license for their crimes, but a new lease of their power. Such a surrender would be only the beginning of long-continued, unutterable troubles, breaking forth in bloodshed and sorrow without end.

*Impossible, because Slavery is the Rebellion.*

(5.) But, lastly, this surrender cannot be made without surrender to the Rebellion. Already I have exhibited the identity between Slavery and the Rebellion ; and yet it is proposed to recognize Slavery in the Union. Such a recognition will be the recognition of the Rebellion.

The whole thing is impossible, and not to be tolerated. Too much blood has been shed, and too much treasure has been lavished, to allow this war to close with any such national stultification. The Rebellion must be crushed, whether in the guise of war or under the *alias* of Slavery. It must be trampled out so that it can never show itself again, or prolong itself into another generation. Not to do this completely, is not to do it all. Others may do as they please, but I wash my hands of this great responsibility. History will not hold such surrender blameless. "An orphan's curse would drag to hell a spirit from on high ;" but the orphans of this war must heap their curses heaven-high upon the man who would consent to see its blood and treasure end in nought.

*No Surrender to Slavery.*

Such are the grounds for the repudiation of all surrender to Slavery *in the Union*. I have already shown that there can be no surrender to Slavery *out of the Union*. In either alternative surrender is impossible; but even if it were possible, it would be most perilous and degrading.

*Platforms and Candidates.*

Thus far I have said nothing of platforms or candidates. I have desired to present the issue of principle, so that the patriot could choose without any embarrassment from party associations. Pardon me now if for one moment I bring platforms and candidates to the touchstone.

There is the Baltimore platform, with Abraham Lincoln as candidate. No surrender here. In one resolution it is declared that the war must be prosecuted "with the utmost possible vigor to the *complete suppression of the Rebellion*." In another it is declared "that as Slavery was the cause, and now constitutes the strength of this rebellion, and as it must be always and every-where hostile to the principles of republican government, *justice and the national safety demand its utter and complete extirpation from the soil of the Republic*." There is salvation in these words, which pronounce the doom of Slavery in the name of justice and the national safety. The candidate has solemnly accepted them, not only when he accepted his nomination, but yet again, when, in the discharge of his official duties, he said briefly "To all whom it may concern," that there could be no terms of peace except on the condition of "the integrity of the Union and the abandonment of Slavery." In that letter of the President, unquestionably the best he ever wrote, it is practically declared, in conformity with the Baltimore platform, that there can be no surrender to Slavery in the Union or out of the Union.

Turn to the Chicago platform and its candidate, and what a contrast! There is surrender in both forms: The platform surrenders to Slavery *out of the Union*, and, in proposing a "cessation of hostilities," prepares the way for the recognition of the rebel States. The candidate, in a letter accepting the nomination, surrenders to Slavery *in the Union*. The platform plainly looks to disunion. The letter seems to look to Union; but whether it looks to Union or not, it plainly surrenders to Slavery.

But there is still another surrender in the Chicago platform. While professing a formal devotion to the Union it declines to insist upon "National unity," or "a Union on the basis of the Constitution of the United States." No such terms are employed; but we are invited to seek peace "on the basis of the Federal Union of the States," so that according to this platform it is not the National Union — that Union of the people — accepted by

Washington and defended by Webster, which we are to have, but a "Federal Union of States," where State Sovereignty as accepted by John C. Calhoun and defended by Jefferson Davis, will be supreme; and all this simply for the sake of Slavery.

Look at the Chicago platform or candidate, as you will, and you are constantly brought back to Slavery as the animating impulse. Look at the Baltimore platform or candidate, and you are constantly brought back to Liberty as the animating impulse. And thus again Slavery and Liberty stand face to face—the slave-ship against the May-flower.

There is a contrast between the two platforms which ought not to be forgotten. That of Chicago, while saying nothing against the Rebellion, uses ambiguous language which is interpreted differently by different persons, while that of Baltimore is so plain and unequivocal that it leaves no room for question. But this contrast is greater still, when we look at the two candidates. Perhaps it never was presented between two candidates to the same extent. The Chicago candidate has written a subtle letter, which is interpreted according to the desires of its readers. Some find peace in it, and others find war. And this double-faced proceeding is his bid for the Presidency. I need not remind you that our candidate has never uttered a word of duplicity, and that his speeches and letters can be interpreted only in one way. And such are the two representatives of Slavery and Liberty.

#### *The True Issue.*

Fellow-citizens, such is the issue of principle; such are the platforms and candidates. And, now, I ask fearlessly, are you for Slavery, or are you for Liberty? Or, changing the form of the question, are you for the Rebellion, or are you for your country? For this is the question which you must answer by your votes. In your answer, do not forget, I intreat you, its infinite, far-reaching, many-sided importance. This is no ordinary election. It is a battle-field of the war; and victory at the polls will assure victory everywhere. Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Farragut, all are watching for it. Their trumpets are ready to echo back our election bells.

#### *Grandeur of the Cause.*

In every aspect the contest is vast. It is vast in its relations to our own country; it is vaster still in its relations to other countries. Overthrow Slavery here and you overthrow it everywhere—in Cuba, Brazil, and wherever a slave clanks his chain. The whole execrable pretension of "property in man," wherever it now shows its hideous front, will be driven back into its kindred night. Nor is this all. Overthrow Slavery here and our Republic ascends to untold heights of power and grandeur. Thus far its natural influence has been impaired by Slavery. Let this shame-

ful burthen be dropped, and our example will be the day-star of the world. Liberty, everywhere, in all her struggles, will be animated anew, and the down-trodden in distant lands will hail the day of deliverance. But let Slavery prevail, and our Republic will drop from its transcendent career, while the cause of liberal institutions in all lands will be darkened. There have been great battles in the past, on which Human Progress has been staked. There was Marathon, when the Persian hosts were driven back from Greece ; there was Tours, when the Saracens were arrested in their victorious career by Charles Martel ; there was Lepanto, when the Turks were brought to a stand in their conquests ; there was Waterloo. But our contest is grander. We are fighting for national life, assailed by belligerent Slavery ; but such is the solidarity of nations, and so are mankind knit together, that our battle is now for the liberty of the world. The voice of victory here will resound through the universe.

Never was grander cause or sublimer conflict. Never holier sacrifice. Who is not saddened at the thought of the precious lives that have been given to Liberty's defence ? The soil of the Rebellion is soaked with patriot blood ; its turf is bursting with patriot dead. Surely they have not died in vain. The flag which they upheld will continue to advance. But this depends upon your votes. Therefore, for the sake of that flag, and for the sake of the brave men that bore it, now sleeping where no trumpet of battle can wake them, stand by the flag.

Tell me not of "failure" in this war. There can be but one failure, and that is the failure to make an end of Slavery ; for on this righteous consummation everything depends. Let Liberty be with us, and no power can prevail against us. Let Slavery be acknowledged, and there is no power which will not mock and insult us. Such is the teaching of history, in one of its greatest examples. Napoleon, when compelled to exchange his empire for a narrow island prison, exclaimed in bitterness of spirit, "it is not the coalition which has dethroned me ; it is liberal ideas." It was not the European coalition, marshalling its forces from the Don to the Orkneys, that toppled the man of destiny from his lofty throne ; but it was that Liberty which he had offended. He saw and confessed the terrible antagonist, when he cried out, "I cannot re-establish myself ; I have shocked the people ; I have sinned against *liberal ideas*, and I perish." Memorable words of instruction and warning. It is ideas that rule the world, and, unlike batteries and battalions, they cannot be destroyed or cut to pieces. Let us so conduct this contest that we shall not shock mankind or sin against Liberty. Let us so conduct it that we shall have Providence on our side. Nature has placed the eye in the front, that we may look *forward and upward* ; and it is only

by a contortion that we are able to look behind. Therefore, in looking forward and upward, we follow nature. There was an ancient adventurer who looked behind as he was escaping from the realms of death, and he failed. We, too, shall fail if we look behind. Forward, not backward, is the word; firmly, courageously, faithfully. There must be no false sentiment or cowardice. There must be no fear of "irritating" the rebels. When the Almighty Power hurled Satan and his impious peers

"—— headlong flaming from the ethereal sky,  
With hideous ruin and combustion, down  
To bottomless perdition, there to dwell  
In adamantine chains and penal fire,"

there was no Chicago platform, proposing "a cessation of hostilities, with a view to a convention or other peaceable means;" nor was there any attempt to save the traitors from divine vengeance. Personal injuries we may forgive; but government cannot always forgive. There are cases where pardon is out of place. Society that has been outraged must be protected. That beautiful land, now degraded by Slavery, must be redeemed, and a generous statesmanship must fix forever its immutable condition. If the chiefs of the Rebellion are compelled to give way to emigrants from the North and from Europe, swelling population, creating new values, and opening new commerce; if the "poor whites" are reinstated in their rights; if a whole race is lifted to manhood and womanhood; if roads are extended; if schools are planted,—there will be nothing done inconsistent with that just clemency which I rejoice to consider a public duty. Liberty is the best cultivator, the surest teacher and the most enterprising merchant. The whole country will confess the new-born power, and those commercial cities which now sympathize so perversely with belligerent Slavery, will be among the earliest to enjoy the quickening change. Beyond all question the overthrow of this portentous crime, besides its immeasurable contributions to civilization everywhere, will accomplish two things of direct material advantage; first, it will raise the fee-simple of the whole South, and secondly, it will enlarge the commerce of the whole North.

I turn from these things in humble gratitude to God, as I behold my country at last redeemed and fixed in history, the Columbus of Nations, once in chains, but now hailed as benefactor and discoverer, who gave a New Liberty to mankind. Foreign powers already watch the scene with awe. Saints and patriots from their home in the skies look down with delight; and Washington, who set free his own slaves, exults that the Republic which revered him as Father has followed his example.





# The Barbarism of Slavery.

MR. MADISON THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA OF PROPERTY IN MEN.—*Debates in the Federal Convention, 25th August, 1787.*

## SPEECH

OF

# HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

ON THE

## Bill for the Admission of Kansas as a Free State.

In the United States Senate, June 4, 1860.

Mr. PRESIDENT: Undertaking now, after a silence of more than four years, to address the Senate on this important subject, I should suppress the emotions natural to such an occasion, if I did not declare on the threshold my gratitude to that Supreme Being, through whose benign care I am enabled, after much suffering and many changes, once again to resume my duties here, and to speak for the cause which is so near my heart. To the honored Commonwealth whose representative I am, and also to my immediate associates in this body, with whom I enjoy the fellowship which is found in *thinking alike concerning the Republic*, I owe thanks which I seize this moment to express for the indulgence shown me throughout the protracted seclusion enjoined by medical skill; and I trust that it will not be thought unbefitting in me to put on record here, as an apology for leaving my seat so long vacant, without making way, by resignation, for a successor, that I acted under the illusion of an invalid, whose hopes for restoration to his natural health constantly triumphed over his disappointments.

When last I entered into this debate, it became my duty to expose the Crime against Kansas, and to insist upon the immediate admission of that Territory as a State of this Union, with a Constitution forbidding Slavery. Time has passed; but the question remains. Resuming the discussion precisely where I left it, I am happy to avow that rule of moderation, which, it is said, may venture even to fix the boundaries of wisdom itself. I have no personal griefs to utter; only a barbarous egotism could intrude these

into this chamber. I have no personal wrongs to avenge; only a barbarous nature could attempt to wield that vengeance which belongs to the Lord. The years that have intervened and the tombs that have been opened since I spoke have their voices too, which I cannot fail to hear. Besides, what am I—what is any man among the living or among the dead, compared with the Question before us? It is this alone which I shall discuss, and I open the argument with that easy victory which is found in charity.

The Crime against Kansas stands forth in painful light. Search history, and you cannot find its parallel. The slave-trade is bad; but even this enormity is petty, compared with that elaborate contrivance by which, in a Christian age and within the limits of a Republic, all forms of constitutional liberty were perverted; by which all the rights of human nature were violated, and the whole country was held trembling on the edge of civil war; while all this large exuberance of wickedness, detestable in itself, becomes tenfold more detestable when its origin is traced to the madness for Slavery. The fatal partition between Freedom and Slavery, known as the Missouri Compromise; the subsequent overthrow of this partition, and the seizure of all by Slavery; the violation of plighted faith; the conspiracy to force Slavery at all hazards into Kansas; the successive invasions by which all security there was destroyed, and the electoral franchise itself was trodden down; the sacrilegious seizure of the very polls, and, through pretended forms of law, the imposition of a foreign legislature upon

this Territory; the acts of this legislature, fortifying the Usurpation, and, among other things, establishing test-oaths, calculated to disfranchise actual settlers, friendly to Freedom, and securing the privileges of the citizen to actual strangers friendly to Slavery; the whole crowned by a statute—"the be-all and the end-all" of the whole Usurpation—through which Slavery was not only recognised on this beautiful soil, but made to bristle with a Code of Death such as the world has rarely seen; all these I have fully exposed on a former occasion. And yet the most important part of the argument was at that time left untouched; I mean that which is found in the Character of Slavery. This natural sequel, with the permission of the Senate, I propose now to supply.

Motive is to Crime as soul to body; and it is only when we comprehend the motive that we can truly comprehend the Crime. Here, the motive is found in Slavery and the rage for its extension. Therefore, by logical necessity, must Slavery be discussed; not indirectly, timidly, and sparingly, but directly, openly, and thoroughly. It must be exhibited as it is; alike in its influence and in its animating character, so that not only its outside but its inside may be seen.

This is no time for soft words or excuses. All such are out of place. They may turn away wrath; but what is the wrath of man? This is no time to abandon any advantage in the argument. Senators sometimes announce that they resist Slavery on political grounds only, and remind us that they say nothing of the moral question. This is wrong. Slavery must be resisted not only on political grounds; but on all other grounds, whether social, economical, or moral. Ours is no holiday contest; nor is it any strife of rival factions; of White and Red Roses; of theatric Neri and Bianchi; but it is a solemn battle between Right and Wrong; between Good and Evil. Such a battle cannot be fought with excuses or with rose-water. There is austere work to be done, and Freedom cannot consent to fling away any of her weapons.

If I were disposed to shrink from this discussion, the boundless assumptions now made by Senators on the other side would not allow me. The whole character of Slavery as a pretended form of civilization is put directly in issue, with a pertinacity and a hardihood which banish all reserve on this side. In these assumptions, Senators from South Carolina naturally take the lead. Following Mr. Calhoun, who pronounced "Slavery the most safe and stable basis for free institutions in the world," and Mr. McDuffie, who did not shrink from calling it "the corner-stone of the republican edifice," the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMMOND] insists that "its forms of society are the best in the world;" and his colleague [Mr. CHESNUT] takes up the strain. One Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS]

adds, that Slavery "is but a form of civil government for those who are not fit to govern themselves;" and his colleague [Mr. BROWN] openly vaunts that it "is a great moral, social, and political blessing—a blessing to the slave and a blessing to the master." One Senator from Virginia, [Mr. HUNTER,] in a studied vindication of what he is pleased to call "the social system of the slaveholding States," exalts Slavery as "the normal condition of human society;" "beneficial to the non-slave-owner as it is to the slave-owner"—"best for the happiness of both races;" and, in enthusiastic advocacy, declares, "that the very keystone of the mighty arch, which by its concentrated strength is able to sustain our social superstructure, consists in the black marble block of African slavery. Knock that out," he says, "and the mighty fabric, with all that it upholds, topples and tumbles to its fall." These were his very words; uttered in debate here. And his colleague, [Mr. MASON,] who has never hesitated where Slavery was in question, has proclaimed that it is "*ennobling* to both master and slave"—a word which, so far as the slave was concerned, he changed, on a subsequent day, to "*elevating*," assuming still that it is "*ennobling*" to the master—which is simply a new version of an old assumption, by Mr. McDuffie, of South Carolina, that "Slavery supersedes the necessity of an order of nobility."

Thus, by various voices, is the claim made for Slavery, which is put forward defiantly as a form of civilization—as if its existence were not plainly inconsistent with the first principles of anything that can be called Civilization—except by that figure of speech in classical literature, where a thing takes its name from something which it has not, as the dreadful Fates were called merciful because they were without mercy. And pardon the allusion, if I add, that, listening to these sounding words for Slavery, I am reminded of the kindred extravagance related by that remarkable traveller in China, the late Abbé Huc, of a gloomy hole in which he was lodged, pestered by mosquitoes and exhaling noisome vapors, where light and air entered only by a single narrow aperture, but styled by Chinese pride the Hotel of the Beatitudes.

It is natural that Senators thus insensible to the true character of Slavery, should evince an equal insensibility to the true character of the Constitution. This is shown in the claim now made, and pressed with unprecedented energy, degrading the work of our fathers, that by virtue of the Constitution, the pretended property in man is placed beyond the reach of Congressional prohibition even within Congressional jurisdiction, so that the Slave-master may at all times enter the broad outlying Territories of the Union with the victims of his oppression, and there continue to hold them by lash and chain.

Such are the two assumptions, the *first* an

assumption of fact, and the *second* an assumption of constitutional law, which are now made without apology or hesitation. I meet them both. To the first I oppose the essential Barbarism of Slavery, in all its influences, whether high or low, as Satan is Satan still, whether towering in the sky or squatting in the toad. To the second I oppose the unanswerable, irresistible truth, that the Constitution of the United States nowhere recognises property in man. These two assumptions naturally go together. They are "twins" suckled by the same wolf. They are the "couple" in the present slave hunt. And the latter cannot be answered without exposing the former. It is only when Slavery is exhibited in its truly hateful character, that we can fully appreciate the absurdity of the assumption, which, in defiance of the express letter of the Constitution, and without a single sentence, phrase, or word, upholding human bondage, yet foists into this blameless text the barbarous idea that man can hold property in man.

On former occasions, I have discussed Slavery only incidentally; as, in unfolding the principle that Slavery is Sectional and Freedom National; in exposing the unconstitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Bill; in vindicating the Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory; in exhibiting the imbecility throughout the Revolution of the Slave States, and especially of South Carolina; and lastly, in unmasking the Crime against Kansas. On all these occasions, where I have spoken at length, I have said too little of the character of Slavery, partly because other topics were presented, and partly from a disinclination which I have always felt to press the argument against those whom I knew to have all the sensitiveness of a sick man. But, God be praised, this time has passed, and the debate is now lifted from details to principles. Grander debate has not occurred in our history; rarely in any history; nor can this debate close or subside except with the triumph of Freedom.

**FIRST ASSUMPTION.**—Of course I begin with the assumption of fact.

It was the often-quoted remark of John Wesley, who knew well how to use words, as also how to touch hearts, that Slavery was "the sum of all villainies." The phrase is pungent; but it would be rash in any of us to criticize the testimony of that illustrious founder of Methodism, whose ample experience of Slavery in Georgia and the Carolinas seems to have been all condensed in this sententious judgment. Language is feeble to express all the enormity of this institution, which is now vaunted as in itself a form of civilization, "ennobling" at least to the master, if not to the slave. Look at it in whatever light you will, and it is always the scab, the canker, the "bare-bones," and the shame of the country; wrong, not merely in the abstract, as is often admitted by its apol-

ogists, but wrong in the concrete also, and possessing no single element of right. Look at it in the light of principles, and it is nothing less than a huge insurrection against the eternal law of God, involving in its pretensions the denial of all human rights, and also the denial of that Divine Law in which God himself is manifest, thus being practically the grossest lie and the grossest Atheism. Founded in violence, sustained only by violence, such a wrong must by a sure law of compensation blast the master as well as the slave; blast the lands on which they live; blast the community of which they are a part; blast the Government which does not forbid the outrage; and the longer it exists and the more completely it prevails, must its blasting influences penetrate the whole social system. Barbarous in origin; barbarous in its law; barbarous in all its pretensions; barbarous in the instruments it employs; barbarous in consequences; barbarous in spirit; barbarous wherever it shows itself, Slavery must breed Barbarians, while it develops everywhere, alike in the individual and in the society to which he belongs, the essential elements of Barbarism. In this character it is now conspicuous before the world.

In undertaking now to expose the **BARBARISM OF SLAVERY**, the whole broad field is open before me. There is nothing in its character, its manifold wrong, its wretched results, and especially in its influence on the class who claim to be "ennobled" by it, that will not fall naturally under consideration.

I know well the difficulty of this discussion involved in the humiliating Truth with which I begin. Senators on former occasions, revealing their sensibility, have even protested against any comparison between what were called the "two civilizations," meaning the two social systems produced respectively by Freedom and by Slavery. The sensibility and the protest are not unnatural, though mistaken. "Two civilizations!" Sir, in this nineteenth century of Christian light, there can be but one Civilization, and this is where Freedom prevails. Between Slavery and Civilization there is an essential incompatibility. If you are for the one, you cannot be for the other; and just in proportion to the embrace of Slavery is the divorce from Civilization. That Slave-masters should be disturbed when this is exposed, might be expected. But the assumptions now so boastfully made, while they may not prevent the sensibility, yet surely exclude all ground of protest when these assumptions are exposed.

Nor is this the only difficulty. Slavery is a bloody Touch-me-not, and everywhere in sight now blooms the bloody flower. It is on the way side as we approach the national capital; it is on the marble steps which we mount; it flaunts on this floor. I stand now in the house of its friends. About me while I speak are its most sensitive guardians, who have shown in the past how much they are

ready either to do or not to do where Slavery is in question. Menaces to deter me have not been spared. But I should ill deserve this high post of duty here, with which I have been honored by a generous and enlightened people, if I could hesitate. Idolatry has been often exposed in the presence of idolaters, and hypocrisy has been chastised in the presence of Scribes and Pharisees. Such examples may give encouragement to a Senator who undertakes in this presence to expose Slavery; nor can any language, directly responsive to the assumptions now made for this Barbarism, be open to question. Slavery can only be painted in the sternest colors; but I cannot forget that nature's sternest painter has been called the best.

The BARBARISM OF SLAVERY appears; first in the character of Slavery, and secondly in the character of Slave-masters. Under the first head we shall naturally consider (1) the Law of Slavery and its Origin, and (2) the practical results of Slavery as shown in a comparison between the Free States and the Slave States. Under the second head we shall naturally consider (1) Slave-masters as shown in the Law of Slavery; (2) Slave-masters in their relations with slaves, here glancing at their three brutal instruments; and (3) Slave-masters in their relations with each other, with society, and with Government; and (4) Slave-masters in their unconsciousness.

The way will then be prepared for the consideration of the assumption of constitutional law.

I. In presenting the CHARACTER OF SLAVERY, there is little for me to do, except to allow Slavery to paint itself. When this is done, the picture will need no explanatory words.

(1.) I begin with the *Law of Slavery and its Origin*, and here this Barbarism paints itself in its own chosen definition. It is simply this: Man, created in the image of God, is divested of his human character, and declared to be a "chattel"—that is, a beast, a thing or article of property. That this statement may not seem to be put forward without precise authority, I quote the statutes of three different States, beginning with South Carolina, whose voice for Slavery always has an unerring distinctiveness. Here is the definition supplied by this State:

"Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law, to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their owners and possessors and their executors, administrators, and assigns, to all intents, constructions, and purposes whatsoever."—2 *Brev. Dig.*, 229.

And here is the definition supplied by the Civil Code of Louisiana:

"A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire anything, but what must belong to his master."—*Civit. Code*, art. 35.

In similar spirit, the law of Maryland thus indirectly defines a slave as an *article*:

"In case the personal property of a ward shall consist of specific articles, such as slaves, working beasts, animals of any kind, the court, if it deem it advantageous for the ward, may at any time pass an order for the sale thereof."—*Statutes of Maryland*.

Not to occupy time unnecessarily, I present a summary of the pretended law defining Slavery in all the Slave States, as made by a careful writer, Judge Stroud, in a work of juridical as well as philanthropic merit:

"The cardinal principle of Slavery—that the slave is not to be ranked among sentient beings, but among things—is an article of property—a chattel personal—obtains as undoubted law in all of these [Slave] States."—*Stroud's Law of Slavery*, p. 22.

Out of this definition, as from a solitary germ, which in its pettiness might be crushed by the hand, towers our Upas Tree and all its gigantic poison. Study it, and you will comprehend the whole monstrous growth.

Sir, look at its plain import, and see the relation which it establishes. The slave is held simply for the use of his master, to whose behests, his life, liberty, and happiness, are devoted, and by whom he may be bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped as cargo, stored as goods, sold on execution, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming table on the hazard of a card or a die; all according to law. Nor is there anything, within the limit of life, inflicted on a beast which may not be inflicted on the slave. He may be marked like a hog, branded like a mule, yoked like an ox, hobbled like a horse, driven like an ass, sheared like a sheep, maimed like a cur, and constantly beaten like a brute; all according to law. And should life itself be taken, what is the remedy? The Law of Slavery, imitating that rule of evidence which, in barbarous days and barbarous countries, prevented a Christian from testifying against a Mahomedan, openly pronounces the incompetency of the whole African race—whether bond or free—to testify in any case against a white man, and, thus having already surrendered the slave to all possible outrage, crowns its tyranny, by excluding the very testimony through which the bloody cruelty of the Slave-master might be exposed.

Thus in its Law does Slavery paint itself; but it is only when we look at details, and detect its essential elements—five in number—all inspired by a single motive, that its character becomes completely manifest.

Foremost, of course, in these elements, is the impossible pretension, where Barbarism is lost in impiety, by which man claims *property in man*. Against such arrogance the argument is brief. According to the law of nature, written by the same hand that placed the planets in their orbits, and like them, constituting a part of the eternal system of the Universe, every human being has a complete title to himself direct from the Almighty. Naked he is born; but this birthright is inseparable from the human form. A man may be poor in this world's goods; but he owns himself. No war or robbery, ancient or recent; no capture; no mid-

idle passage ; no change of clime ; no purchase money ; no transmission from hand to hand, no matter how many times, and no matter at what price, can defeat this indefeasible God-given franchise. And a Divine mandate, strong as that which guards Life, guards Liberty also. Even at the very morning of Creation, when God said, let there be Light—earlier than the malediction against murder—He set an everlasting difference between man and a chattel, giving to man dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth :

— that right we hold  
By His donation ; but man over men  
He made not lord, such title to Himself  
Reserving, human left from human free.

Slavery tyrannically assumes a power which Heaven denied, while, under its barbarous necromancy, borrowed from the Source of Evil, a man is changed into a chattel—a person is withered into a thing—a soul is shrunk into merchandise. Say, sir, in your madness, that you own the sun, the stars, the moon ; but do not say that you own a man, endowed with a soul that shall live immortal, when sun and moon and stars have passed away.

Secondly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of marriage*, recognised as a sacrament by the church, and recognised as a contract wherever civilization prevails. Under the law of Slavery, no such sacrament is respected, and no such contract can exist. The ties that may be formed between slaves are all subject to the selfish interests or more selfish lust of the master, whose license knows no check. Natural affections which have come together are rudely torn asunder ; nor is this all. Stripped of every defence, the chastity of a whole race is exposed to violence, while the result is recorded in the tell-tale faces of children, glowing with their master's blood, but doomed for their mother's skin to Slavery, through all descending generations. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Brown] is galled by the comparison between Slavery and Polygamy, and winces. I hail this sensibility as the sign of virtue. Let him reflect, and he will confess, that there are many disgusting elements in Slavery, which are not present in Polygamy, while the single disgusting element of Polygamy is more than present in Slavery. By the license of Polygamy, one man may have many wives, all bound to him by the marriage tie, and in other respects protected by law. By the license of Slavery, a whole race is delivered over to prostitution and concubinage, without the protection of any law. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous ?

Thirdly. Slavery paints itself again in its complete *abrogation of the parental relation*, which God in his benevolence has provided for the nurture and education of the human family, and which constitutes an essential part

of Civilization itself. And yet, by the law of Slavery — happily beginning to be modified in some places—this relation is set at naught, and in its place is substituted the arbitrary control of the master, at whose mere command little children, such as the Saviour called unto him, though clasped by a mother's arms, may be swept under the hammer of the auctioneer. I do not dwell on this exhibition. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous ?

Fourthly. Slavery paints itself again in *closing the gates of knowledge*, which are also the shining gates of civilization. Under its plain unequivocal law, the bondman may, at the unrestrained will of his master, be shut out from all instruction, while in many places, incredible to relate ! the law itself, by cumulative provisions, positively forbids that he shall be taught to read. Of course, the slave cannot be allowed to read, for his soul would then expand in larger air, while he saw the glory of the North Star, and also the helping truth, that God, who made iron, never made a slave ; for he would then become familiar with the Scriptures, with the Decalogue still speaking in the thunders of Sinai ; with that ancient text, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely be put to death ;" with that other text, "Masters, give unto your servants that which is just and equal ;" with that great story of redemption, when the Lord raised the slave-born Moses to deliver his chosen people from the house of bondage ; and with that sublimer story, where the Saviour died a cruel death, that all men, without distinction of race, might be saved—leaving to mankind commandments, which, even without his example, make Slavery impossible. Thus, in order to fasten your manacles upon the slave, you fasten other manacles upon his soul. Sir, is not Slavery barbarous ?

Fifthly. Slavery paints itself again in the *appropriation of all the toil* of its victims, excluding them from that property in their own earnings, which the law of nature allows, and civilization secures. The painful injustice of this pretension is lost in its meanness. It is robbery and petty larceny under the garb of law. And even its meanness is lost in the absurdity of its associate pretension, that the African, thus despoiled of all his earnings, is saved from poverty, and that for his own good he must work for his master, and not for himself. Alas ! by such a fallacy, is a whole race pauperized ! And yet this transaction is not without illustrative example. A solemn poet, whose verse has found wide favor, pictures a creature who,

— With one hand put  
A penny in the urn of poverty,  
And with the other took a shilling out.

*Pollot's "Course of Time," Book VIII, 632.*

And a celebrated traveller through Russia, more than a generation ago, describes a kindred spirit, who, while on his knees before an altar of the Greek Church, devoutly told his

beads with one hand, and with the other deliberately picked the pocket of a fellow-sinner by his side. Not admiring these instances, I cannot cease to deplore a system which has much of both, while, under an affectation of charity, it sordidly takes from the slave all the fruits of his bitter sweat, and thus takes from him the mainspring to exertion. Tell me, sir, is not Slavery barbarous?

Such is Slavery in its five special elements of Barbarism, as recognised by law; first, assuming that man can hold property in man; secondly, abrogating the relation of husband and wife; thirdly, abrogating the parental tie; fourthly, closing the gates of knowledge; and fifthly, appropriating the unpaid labor of another. Take away these elements, sometimes called "abuses," and Slavery will cease to exist, for it is these very "abuses" which constitute Slavery. Take away any one of them, and the abolition of Slavery begins. And when I present Slavery for judgment, I mean no slight evil, with regard to which there may be a reasonable difference of opinion, but I mean this five-fold embodiment of "abuse"—this ghastly quincunx of Barbarism—each particular of which, if considered separately, must be denounced at once with all the ardor of an honest soul, while the whole five-fold combination must awake a five-fold denunciation.

But this five-fold combination becomes still more hateful when its *single motive* is considered. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. DAVIS] says that it is "but a form of civil government for those who are not fit to govern themselves." The Senator is mistaken. It is an outrage where five different pretensions all concur in one single object, looking only to the profit of the master, and constituting its ever-present motive power, which is simply to *compel the labor of fellow-men without wages!*

If the offence of Slavery were less extended; if it were confined to some narrow region; if it had less of grandeur in its proportions; if its victims were counted by tens and hundreds, instead of millions, the five-headed enormity would find little indulgence. All would rise against it, while religion and civilization would lavish their choicest efforts in the general warfare. But what is wrong when done to one man cannot be right when done to many. If it is wrong thus to degrade a single soul—if it is wrong thus to degrade you, Mr. President—it cannot be right to degrade a whole race. And yet this is denied by the barbarous logic of Slavery, which, taking advantage of its own wrong, claims immunity because its usurpation has assumed a front of audacity that cannot be safely attacked. Unhappily, there is Barbarism elsewhere in the world; but American Slavery, as defined by existing law, stands forth as the greatest organized Barbarism on which the sun now shines. It is without a single peer. Its author, after making it, broke the die.

If curiosity carries us to the origin of this law—and here I approach a topic often considered in this Chamber—we shall confess again its Barbarism. It is not derived from the common law, that fountain of Liberty; for this law, while unhappily recognising a system of servitude, known as villeinage, secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave; protected his person against mayhem; protected his wife against rape; gave to his marriage equal validity with the marriage of his master, and surrounded his offspring with generous presumptions of Freedom, unlike that rule of yours by which the servitude of the mother is necessarily stamped upon the child. It is not derived from the Roman law, that fountain of tyranny, for two reasons—first, because this law, in its better days, when its early rigors were spent—like the common law itself—secured to the bondman privileges unknown to the American slave—in certain cases of cruelty rescued him from his master—prevented the separation of parents and children, also of brothers and sisters—and even protected him in the marriage relation; and secondly, because the Thirteen Colonies were not derived from any of those countries which recognised the Roman law, while this law even before the discovery of this continent had lost all living efficacy. It is not derived from the Mahomedan law; for under the mild injunctions of the Koran, a benignant servitude, unlike yours, has prevailed—where the lash is not allowed to lacerate the back of a female; where no knife or branding-iron is employed upon any human being to mark him as the property of his fellow-man; where the master is expressly enjoined to listen to the desires of his slave for emancipation; and where the blood of the master, mingling with his bond-woman, takes from her the transferable character of a chattel, and confers complete freedom upon their offspring. It is not derived from the Spanish law; for this law contains humane elements, unknown to your system, borrowed, perhaps, from the Mahomedan Moors who so long occupied Spain; and, besides, our Thirteen Colonies had no umbilical connection with Spain. Nor is it derived from English statutes or American statutes; for we have the positive and repeated averment of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MASON] and also of other Senators that in not a single State of the Union can any such statutes establishing Slavery be found. From none of these does it come.

No, sir; not from any land of civilization is this Barbarism derived. It comes from Africa; ancient nurse of monsters; from Guinea, Dahomey, and Congo. There is its origin and fountain. This benighted region, we are told by Chief Justice Marshall in a memorable judgment, (*The Antelope*, 10 Wheaton R., 66) still asserts a right, discarded by Christendom, to enslave captives taken in war; and this African Barbarism is the beginning of American

Slavery. And the Supreme Court of Georgia, a Slave State, has not shrunk from this conclusion. "Licensed to hold slave property," says the Court, "the Georgia planter held the slave as a chattel; either directly from the slave-trader, or from those who held under him, and he from the slave-captor in Africa. The property of the planter in the slave became, thus, the property of the original captor." (*Neal v. Farmer*, 9 *Georgia Reports*, p. 555.) It is natural that a right, thus derived in defiance of Christendom, and openly founded on the most vulgar Paganism, should be exercised without any mitigating influence from Christianity; that the master's authority over the person of his slave—over his conjugal relations—over his parental relations—over the employment of his time—over all his acquisitions, should be recognised, while no generous presumption inclines to Freedom, and the womb of the bond-woman can deliver only a slave.

From its home in Africa, where it is sustained by immemorial usage, this Barbarism, thus derived and thus developed, traversed the ocean to American soil. It entered on board that fatal slave-ship "built in the eclipse, and rigged with curses dark," which in 1620 landed its cruel cargo at Jamestown, in Virginia, and it has boldly taken its place in every succeeding slave-ship from that early day till now—helping to pack the human freight, regardless of human agony; surviving the torments of the middle passage; surviving its countless victims plunged beneath the waves; and it has left the slave-ship only to travel inseparable from the slave in his various doom, sanctioning by its barbarous code every outrage, whether of mayhem or robbery, of lash or lust, and fastening itself upon his offspring to the remotest generation. Thus are the barbarous prerogatives of barbarous half-naked African chiefs perpetuated in American Slave-masters, while the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON,] perhaps unconscious of their origin—perhaps desirous to secure for them the appearance of a less barbarous pedigree—tricks them out with a phrase of the Roman law, discarded by the common law, *partus sequitur ventrem*, which simply renders into ancient Latin an existing rule of African Barbarism, recognised as an existing rule of American Slavery.

Such is the plain juridical origin of the American slave code, which is now vaunted as a badge of Civilization. But all law, whatever may be its juridical origin, whether English or Mahomedan, Roman or African, may be traced to other and ampler influences in nature, sometimes of Right, and sometimes of Wrong. Surely the law which blasted the slave-trade as piracy punishable with death had a different inspiration from that other law, which secured immunity for the slave-trade throughout an immense territory, and invested its supporters with political power. As there

is a higher law above, so there is a lower law below, and each is felt in human affairs.

Thus far, we have seen Slavery only in its pretended law, and in the origin of that law. And here I might stop, without proceeding in this argument; for, on the letter of the law alone Slavery must be condemned. But the tree is known by its fruits, and these I now shall exhibit; and this brings me to the second stage of the argument.

(2.) In considering the *practical results of Slavery*, the materials are so obvious and diversified, that my chief care will be to abridge and reject; and here I shall put the Slave States and Free States face to face, showing at each point the blasting influence of Slavery.

The States where this Barbarism now exists excel the Free States in all natural advantages. Their territory is more extensive, stretching over 851,448 square miles, while the Free States, including California, embrace only 612,597 square miles. Here is a difference of more than 238,000 square miles in favor of the Slave States, showing that Freedom starts in this great controversy, with a field more than a quarter less than that of Slavery. In happiness of climate, adapted to productions of special value; in exhaustless motive power distributed throughout its space; in natural highways, by more than fifty navigable rivers, never closed by the rigors of winter, and in a stretch of coast along ocean and gulf, indented by hospitable harbors—the whole presenting incomparable advantages for that true civilization where agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, both domestic and foreign, blend—in all these respects the Slave States excel the Free States, whose climate is often churlish, whose motive power is less various, whose navigable rivers are fewer and often sealed by ice, and whose coast, while less in extent and with fewer harbors, is often perilous from storm and cold.

But Slavery plays the part of a Harpy, and defiles the choicest banquet. See what it does with this territory, thus spacious and fair.

An important indication of prosperity is to be found in the growth of *population*. In this respect the two regions started equal. In 1790, at the first census under the Constitution, the population of the present Slave States was 1,961,372, of the present Free States 1,968,455, showing a difference of only 7,083 in favor of the Free States. This difference, at first merely nominal, has been constantly increasing since, showing itself more strongly in each decennial census, until, in 1850, the population of the Slave States, swollen by the annexation of three foreign Territories, Louisiana, Florida, and Texas, was only 9,612,769, while that of the Free States, without any such annexations, reached 13,434,922, showing a difference of 3,822,153 in favor of Free-

dom. But this difference becomes still more remarkable, if we confine our inquiries to the white population, which, at this period, was only 6,184,477 in the Slave States, while it was 13,238,670 in the Free States, showing a difference of more than 7,054,193 in favor of Freedom, and showing that the white population of the Free States had not only doubled but commenced to triple that of the Slave States, although occupying a smaller territory. The comparative sparseness of the two populations furnishes another illustration. In the Slave States the average number of inhabitants to a square mile was 11.28, while in the Free States it was 21.93, or almost two to one in favor of Freedom.

These results are general; but if we take any particular Slave State, and compare it with a Free State, we shall find the same constant evidence for Freedom. Take Virginia, with a territory of 61,352 miles, and New York, with a territory of 47,000, or over 14,000 square miles less than her sister State. New York has one sea-port, Virginia some three or four; New York has one noble river, Virginia has several; New York for 400 miles runs along the frozen line of Canada; Virginia basks in a climate of constant felicity. But Freedom is better than climate, rivers, or sea-port!

In 1790 the population of Virginia was 748,308, and in 1850 it was 1,421,661. In 1790, the population of New York was 340,120, and in 1850 it was 3,097,394; that of Virginia had not doubled in sixty years, while that of New York had multiplied more than nine-fold. A similar comparison may be made between Kentucky, with 37,680 square miles, admitted into the Union as long ago as 1790, and Ohio, with 39,964 square miles, admitted into the Union in 1802. In 1850, the Slave State had a population of only 982,405, while Ohio had a population of 1,980,329, showing a difference of nearly a million in favor of Freedom.

As in population, so also in the *value of property, real and personal*, do the Free States excel the Slave States. According to the census of 1850, the value of property in the Free States was \$4,107,162,198, while in the Slave States it was \$2,936,090,737; or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, only \$1,655,945,137—showing an enormous difference of billions in favor of Freedom. In the Free States the valuation per acre was \$10.47, in the Slave States only \$3.04. This disproportion was still greater in 1855, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, when the valuation of the Free States was \$5,770,194,680; or \$14.72 per acre; and of the Slave States, \$3,977,353,946, or, if we deduct the asserted property in human flesh, \$2,505,186,346, or \$4.59 per acre. Thus, in five years from 1850, the valuation of property in the Free States received an increase of more than the whole accumulated valuation of the Slave States at that time.

Looking at details, we find the same disproportions. Arkansas and Michigan, equal in territory, were admitted into the Union in the same year; and yet, in 1855, the whole valuation of Arkansas, including its asserted property in human flesh, was only \$64,240,726, while that of Michigan, without a single slave, was \$116,593,580. The whole accumulated valuation of all the Slave States, deducting the asserted property in human flesh, in 1850, was only \$1,655,945,137; but the valuation of New York alone, in 1855, reached the nearly equal sum of \$1,401,285,279. The valuation of Virginia, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Texas, all together, in 1850, deducting human flesh, was \$573,332,860, or simply \$1.81 per acre—being less than that of Massachusetts alone, which was \$573,342,286, or \$114.85 per acre.

The Slave States boast of *agriculture*; but here again, notwithstanding their superior natural advantages, they must yield to the free States at every point, in the number of farms and plantations, in the number of acres of improved lands, in the cash value of farms, in the average value per acre, and in the value of farming implements and machinery. Here is a short table:

*Free States.*—Number of farms, 877,736; acres of improved land, 57,688,040; cash value of farms, \$2,143,344,437; average value per acre, \$19.83; value of farming implements, \$85,736,658.

*Slave States.*—Number of farms, 564,203; acres of improved land, 54,970,427; cash value of farms, \$1,117,649,649; average value per acre, \$6.18; value of farming implements, \$65,345,625.

Such is the mighty contrast. But it does not stop here. Careful tables place the agricultural products of the Free States, for the year ending June, 1850, at \$858,634,334, while those of the Slave States were \$631,277,417; the product per acre in the Free States at \$7.94, and the product per acre in the Slave States at \$3.49; and the average product of each agriculturist in the Free States at \$342, and in the Slave States at \$171. Thus the Free States, with a smaller population engaged in agriculture than the Slave States, with smaller territory, show an annual sum total of agricultural products surpassing those of the Slave States by two hundred and twenty-seven millions of dollars, while twice as much is produced on an acre, and more than twice as much is produced by each agriculturist. The monopoly of cotton, rice, and cane sugar, with a climate granting two and sometimes three crops in a year, are thus impotent in the competition with Freedom.

In *manufactures*, the failure of the Slave States is greater still. It appears at all points, in the capital employed, in the value of the raw material, in the annual wages, and in the annual product. A short table will show the contrast:

*Free States.*—Capital, \$430,240,051; value of raw material, \$465,844,092; annual wages, \$195,976,453; annual product, \$842,586,058.

*Slave States.*—Capital, \$95,029,879; value of raw material, \$86,190,639; annual wages, \$83,257,360; annual product, \$165,413,027.

This might be illustrated by details with regard to different manufactures—whether of shoes, cotton, woollen, pig iron, wrought iron, and iron castings—all showing the contrast. It might also be illustrated by a comparison between different States; showing, for instance, that the manufactures of Massachusetts, during the last year, exceeded those of all the Slave States combined.

In commerce, the failure of the Slave States is on yet a larger scale. Under this head, the census does not supply proper statistics, and we are left, therefore, to approximations from other quarters; but these are enough for our purpose. It appears that, of the products which enter into commerce, the Free States had an amount valued at \$1,377,199,968; the Slave States an amount valued only at \$410,754,992; that of the persons engaged in trade, the Free States had 136,856, and the Slave States 52,622; and that of the tonnage employed, the Free States had 2,790,195 tons, and the Slave States only 726,285. This was in 1850. But in 1855 the disproportion was still greater, the Free States having 4,252,615 tons, and the Slave States 855,517 tons, being a difference of five to one; and the tonnage of Massachusetts alone being 970,727 tons, an amount larger than that of all the Slave States. The tonnage built during this year by the Free States was 528,844 tons; by the Slave States, 52,959 tons. Maine alone built 215,905 tons, or more than four times the whole built in the Slave States.

The foreign commerce, as indicated by the exports and imports in 1855, of the Free States, was \$404,368,503; of the Slave States, \$132,067,216. The exports of the Free States were \$167,520,693; of the Slave States, including the vaunted cotton crop, \$132,007,216. The imports of the Free States were \$236,847,810; of the Slave States, \$24,586,528. The foreign commerce of New York alone was more than twice as large as that of all the Slave States; her imports were larger, and her exports were larger also. Add to this testimony of figures the testimony of a Virginian, Mr. Loudon, in a letter written just before the sitting of a Southern Commercial Convention. Thus he complains and testifies:

"There are not half a dozen vessels engaged in our own trade that are owned in Virginia; and I have been unable to find a vessel at Liverpool loading for Virginia within three years, during the height of our busy season."

*Railroads and canals* are the avenues of commerce; and here again the Free States excel. Of railroads in operation in 1854, there were 13,105 miles in the Free States, and 4,212 in the Slave States. Of canals there were 3,682 miles in the Free States, and 1,116 in the Slave States.

The *Post Office*, which is not only the agent of commerce, but of civilization, joins in the uniform testimony. According to the tables for 1859, the postage collected in the Free States was \$5,532,999, and the expense of carrying the mails \$6,748,189, leaving a deficit of \$1,215,189. In the Slave States the amount collected was only \$1,988,050, and the expense of carrying the mails \$6,016,612, leaving the enormous deficit of \$4,028,568; the difference between the two deficits being \$2,813,372. The Slave States did not pay one-third of the expense of transporting their mails; and not a single Slave State paid for the transportation of its mails; not even the small State of Delaware. Massachusetts, besides paying for hers, had a surplus larger than the whole amount collected in South Carolina.

According to the census of 1850, the value of *churches* in the Free States was \$67,773,477; in the Slave States, \$21,674,581.

The *voluntary charity* contributed in 1855, for certain leading purposes of Christian benevolence, was, in the Free States, \$953,813; for the same purposes, in the Slave States, \$194,784. For the Bible cause, the Free States contributed \$319,667; the Slave States, \$68,125. For the missionary cause, the first contributed \$319,667; and the second, \$101,934. For the Tract Society, the first contributed \$131,972; and the second, \$24,725. The amount contributed in Massachusetts for the support of missions was greater than that contributed by all the Slave States, and more than eight times that contributed by South Carolina.

Nor have the Free States been backward in charity, when the Slave States have been smitten. The records of Massachusetts show that as long ago as 1781, at the beginning of the Government, there was an extensive contribution throughout the Commonwealth, under the particular direction of that eminent patriot, Samuel Adams, for the relief of inhabitants of South Carolina and Georgia. In 1855 we were saddened by the prevalence of yellow fever in Portsmouth, Virginia; and now, from a report of the relief committee of that place, we learn that the amount of charity contributed by the Slave States, exclusive of Virginia, the afflicted State, was \$12,182; and, including Virginia, it was \$33,398; while \$42,547 were contributed by the Free States.

In all this array we see the fatal influence of Slavery, but its Barbarism is yet more conspicuous when we consider its *Educational Establishments*, and the unhappy results, which naturally ensue from their imperfect character.

Of *colleges*, in 1856, the Free States had 61, and the Slave States 59; but the comparative efficacy of the institutions which assume this name may be measured by certain facts. The number of graduates in the Free States was 47,752, in the Slave States 19,648; the number of ministers educated in Slave colleges was 747, in the Free colleges 10,702; and the number of

volumes in the libraries of Slave colleges 308,011; in the libraries of the Free colleges 667,227. If the materials were at hand for a comparison between these colleges, in buildings, cabinets, and scientific apparatus, or in the standard of scholarship, the difference would be still more apparent.

Of *professional schools*, teaching law, medicine, and theology, the Free States had 65, with 269 professors, 4,426 students, and 175,951 volumes in their libraries, while the Slave States had only 32 professional schools, with 122 professors, 1,807 students, and 30,796 volumes in their libraries. The whole number educated at these institutions in the Free States was 23,513, in the Slave States 3,812. Of these, the largest number in the Slave States study law, next medicine, and lastly theology. According to the census, there are only 808 in the Slave theological schools, and 747 studying for the ministry in the Slave colleges; and this is all the record we have of the education of the Slave clergy.

Of *academies and private schools*, in 1850, the Free States, notwithstanding their multitudinous public schools, had 3,197, with 7,175 teachers, 154,893 pupils, and an annual income of \$2,457,372; the Slave States had 2,797 academies and private schools, with 4,913 teachers, 104,976 pupils, and an annual income of \$2,079,724. In the absence of public schools, to a large extent, where Slavery exists, the dependence must be chiefly upon private schools; and yet even in these the Slave States fall below the Free States, whether we consider the number of pupils, the number of teachers, or the amount paid for their support.

In *public schools*, open to all, alike the poor and the rich, the eminence of the Free States is complete. Here the figures show a difference as wide as that between Freedom and Slavery. Their number in the Free States is 62,433, with 72,621 teachers, and with 2,769,901 pupils, supported by an annual expense of \$6,780,337. Their number in the Slave States is 18,507, with 19,307 teachers, and with 581,861 pupils, supported by an annual expense of \$2,719,534. This difference may be illustrated by details. Virginia, an old State, and more than a third larger than Ohio, has 67,353 pupils in her public schools, while the latter State has 484,153. Arkansas, equal in age and size with Michigan, has only 8,493 pupils at her public schools, while the latter State has 110,455. South Carolina, three times as large as Massachusetts, has 17,838 pupils at public school, while the latter State has 176,475. South Carolina spends for this purpose, annually, \$200,600; Massachusetts, \$1,006,795. Baltimore, with a population of 169,012, on the northern verge of Slavery, has school buildings valued at \$105,729; those of Boston are valued at \$729,502. Boston, with a population smaller than that of Baltimore, has 203 public schools, with 353 teachers, and 21,678 pupils, supported

at an annual expense of \$237,000; Baltimore has only 36 public schools, with 138 teachers, and 8,011 pupils, supported at an annual expense of \$32,423. But even these figures do not disclose the whole difference; for there exist in the Free States teachers' institutes, normal schools, lyceums, and public courses of lectures, which are unknown in the region of Slavery. These advantages are enjoyed also by the children of colored persons; and here is a comparison which shows the degradation of the Slave States. It is their habit particularly to deride free colored persons. See, now, with what cause. The number of colored persons in the Free States is 196,016, of whom 22,043, or more than one-ninth, attend school, which is a larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of the Slave States. In Massachusetts there are 9,064 colored persons, of whom 1,439, or nearly one-sixth, attend school, which is a much larger proportion than is supplied by the whites of South Carolina.

Among educational establishments are *public libraries*; and here, again, the Free States have their customary eminence, whether we consider libraries strictly called public, or libraries of the common school, of the Sunday school, of the college, and of the church. Here the disclosures are startling. The number of libraries in the Free States is 14,911, and the sum total of volumes is 3,888,234; the number of libraries in the Slave States is 695, and the sum total of volumes is 649,577; showing an excess for Freedom of more than fourteen thousand libraries, and more than three millions of volumes. In the Free States the common school libraries are 11,881, and contain 1,589,683 volumes; in the Slave States they are 186, and contain 57,721 volumes. In the Free States the Sunday school libraries are 1,713, and contain 478,858 volumes; in the Slave States they are 275, and contain 63,463 volumes. In the Free States the college libraries are 132, and contain 660,573 volumes; in the Slave States they are 79, and contain 249,248 volumes. In the Free States the church libraries are 109, and contain 52,723 volumes; in the Slave States they are 21, and contain 5,627 volumes. In the Free States the libraries strictly called public, and not included under the heads already enumerated, are 1,058, and contain 1,106,397 volumes; those of the Slave States are 152, and contain 273,518 volumes.

Turn these figures over, look at them in any light, and the conclusion will be irresistible for Freedom. The college libraries alone of the Free States are greater than all the libraries of Slavery. So, also, are the libraries of Massachusetts alone greater than all the libraries of Slavery; and the common school libraries alone of New York are more than twice as large as all the libraries of Slavery. Michigan has 107,943 volumes in her libraries; Arkansas has 420.

Among educational establishments, one of the most efficient is the *Press*; and here again all things testify for Freedom. The Free States excel in the number of newspapers and periodicals published, whether daily, semi-weekly, weekly, semi-monthly, monthly, or quarterly; and whatever their character, whether literary, neutral, political, religious, or scientific. The whole aggregate circulation in the Free States is 334,146,281; in the Slave States, 81,038,693. In Free Michigan, 3,247,736; in Slave Arkansas, 377,000. In Free Ohio, 30,473,407; in Slave Kentucky, 6,582,838. In Slave South Carolina, 7,145,930; in Free Massachusetts, 64,820,564—a larger number than in the ten Slave States, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, combined. This enormous disproportion in the aggregate is also preserved in the details. In the Slave States, political newspapers find more favor than any others; but even of these they publish only 47,243,279 copies, while the Free States publish 163,583,668. Of neutral newspapers, the Slave States publish 8,812,620; the Free States, 79,156,738. Of religious newspapers, the Slave States publish 4,364,832; the Free States, 29,280,652. Of literary journals, the Slave States publish 20,245,360; the Free States, 57,478,768. And of scientific journals, the Slave States publish 372,672; the Free States, 4,521,260. Of these latter, the number of copies published in Massachusetts alone is 2,033,260—more than five times the number in the whole land of Slavery. Thus, in contributions to science, literature, religion, and even politics, as attested by the activity of the periodical press, do the Slave States miserably fail, while darkness gathers over them. And this seems to be increasing with time. According to the census of 1810, the disproportion in this respect between the two regions was only as two to one. It is now more than five to one, and is still going on.

The same disproportion appears with regard to persons connected with the Press. In the Free States, the number of *printers* was 11,822, of whom 1,229 were in Massachusetts; in the slave States there were 2,895, of whom South Carolina had only 141. In the Free States, the number of *publishers* was 331; in the Slave States, 24. Of these, Massachusetts had 59, or more than twice as many as all the Slave States; while South Carolina had none. In the Free States, the *authors* were 73; in the Slave States, 9—of whom Massachusetts had 17, and South Carolina 2. These suggestive illustrations are all derived from the last official census. But if we go to other sources, the contrast is still the same. Of the authors mentioned in Duyckink's *Cyclopedia of American Literature*, 403 are of the Free States, and only 87 of the Slave States. Of the poets mentioned in Griswold's *Poets and Poetry of America*, 123 are of the Free States, and only

17 of the Slave States. Of the poets, whose place of birth appears in Reed's *Female Poets of America*, 73 are of the Free States, and only 11 of the Slave States. And if we try authors by weight or quality, it is the same as when we try them by numbers. Out of the Free States have come all whose works have taken a place in the permanent literature of the country—Irving, Prescott, Sparks, Bancroft, Emerson, Motley, Hildreth, and Hawthorne; also, Bryant, Longfellow, Dana, Hallock, Whittier, and Lowell—and I might add indefinitely to the list. But what name from the Slave States could find a place there?

A similar disproportion appears in the number of *Patents*, attesting the inventive industry of the contrasted regions, issued during the last three years, 1857, 1858, and 1859. In the Free States there were 9,560; in the Slave States, 1,449—making a difference of 8,111 in favor of Freedom. The number in Free Massachusetts was 972; in Slave South Carolina, 39. The number in Free Connecticut, small in territory and population, was 628; in Slave Virginia, large in territory and population, 184.

From all these things we might infer the *ignorance* prevalent in the Slave States; but this shows itself in specific results of a deplorable character, authenticated by the official census. It appears that in the Slave States there were 493,026 native white persons over twenty years of age who cannot read and write, while in the Free States, with double the white population, there were but 248,725 native whites over twenty years of age in this unhappy predicament. In the Slave States the proportion was 1 to 12; in the Free States it was 1 to 53. The number in Free Massachusetts, with a population of nearly a million, was 1,005, or 1 in 517; the number in Slave South Carolina, with a population under three hundred thousand, was 15,580, or 1 in 7. The number in Free Connecticut was 1 in 277; in Slave Virginia, 1 in 5; in free New Hampshire 1 in 201, and in Slave North Carolina, 1 in 3.

Before closing this picture of Slavery, where the dismal colors all come from official figures, there are two other aspects in which for a moment it may be regarded:

1. The first is the influence which it has on *emigration*. It is stated in the official compendium of the census, (page 115,) that those persons living in Slave States who are natives of Free States are more numerous than those living in Free States who are natives of Slave States. This is an egregious error. Just the contrary is true. The census of 1850 found 609,371 in the Free States who were born in the Slave States, while only 206,638 born in the Free States were in the Slave States. And since the white population of the Free States is double that of the Slave States, it appears that the proportion of whites moving from Slavery is six times greater than that of whites moving into slavery. In this simple fact is disclosed some-

thing of the aversion to Slavery which is aroused even in the Slave States.

2. The second aspect is furnished by the character of the region on the border line between Freedom and Slavery. In general, the value of lands in Slave States adjoining Freedom is advanced, while the value of corresponding lands in Free States is diminished. The effects of Freedom and Slavery are reciprocal. Slavery is a bad neighbor. Freedom is a good neighbor. In Virginia, lands naturally poor are, by their nearness to Freedom, worth \$12.98 an acre, while richer lands in other parts of the State are worth only \$8.42. In Illinois, lands bordering upon Slavery are worth only \$4.54 an acre, while other lands in Illinois are worth \$8.05. As in the value of lands so in all other influences is Slavery felt for evil, and Freedom felt for good; and thus is it clearly shown to be for the interest of the Slave States to be surrounded by a circle of Free States.

Thus, at every point is the character of Slavery more and more manifest, rising and dilating into an overshadowing Barbarism, darkening the whole land. Through its influence, population, values of all kinds, manufactures, commerce, railroads, canals, charities, the post office, colleges, professional schools, academies, public schools, newspapers, periodicals, books, authorship, inventions, are all stunted, and, under a Government which professes to be founded on the intelligence of the people, one in twelve of the white adults in the region of Slavery is officially reported as unable to read and write. Never was the saying of Montesquieu more triumphantly verified, that countries are not cultivated by reason of their fertility, but by reason of their liberty. To this truth the Slave States constantly testify by every possible voice. Liberty is the powerful agent which drives the plow, the spindle, and the keel; which opens avenues of all kinds; which inspires charity; which awakens the love of knowledge, and supplies the means of gratifying it. Liberty is the first of schoolmasters.

Unerring and passionless figures thus far have been our witnesses. But their testimony will be enhanced by a final glance at the *geographical character* of the Slave States; and here there is a singular and instructive parallel.

Jefferson described Virginia as fast sinking to be "the Barbary of the Union"—meaning, of course, the Barbary of his day, which had not yet turned against Slavery. In this allusion he was wiser than he knew. Though on different sides of the Atlantic and on different continents, our Slave States and the original Barbary States occupy nearly the same parallels of latitude; occupy nearly the same extent of longitude; embrace nearly the same number of square miles; enjoy kindred advantages of climate, being equally removed from the cold of the North and the burning heat of the tropics; and also enjoy kindred boundaries of land and water,

with kindred advantages of ocean and sea, with this difference, that the boundaries of the two regions are precisely reversed, so that where is land in one case is water in the other, while in both cases there is the same extent of ocean and the same extent of sea. Nor is this all. Algiers, for a long time the most obnoxious place in the Barbary States of Africa, once branded by an indignant chronicler as "the wall of the barbarian world," is situated near the parallel of 36° 30' north latitude, being the line of the Missouri compromise, which once marked the "wall" of Slavery in our country west of the Mississippi, while Morocco, the chief present seat of Slavery in the African Barbary, is on the parallel of Charleston. There are no two spaces on the surface of the globe, equal in extent, (and an examination of the map will verify what I am about to state,) which present so many distinctive features of resemblance; whether we consider the common parallels of latitude on which they lie, the common nature of their boundaries, their common productions, their common climate, or the common Barbarism which sought shelter in both. I do not stop to inquire why Slavery—banished at last from Europe, banished also from that part of this hemisphere which corresponds in latitude to Europe—should have entrenched itself in both hemispheres between the same parallels of latitude, so that Virginia, Carolina, Mississippi, and Missouri, should be the American complement to Morocco, Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis. But there is one important point in the parallel which remains to be fulfilled. The barbarous Emperor of Morocco, in the words of a Treaty, has expressed his desire that Slavery might pass from the memory of men, while Algiers, Tripoli, and Tunis, after cherishing Slavery with a tenacity equalled only by the tenacity of South Carolina, have successively renounced it and delivered it over to the indigation of mankind. In following this example the parallel will be complete, and our Barbary will become the complement in Freedom to the African Barbary, as it has already been its complement in Slavery, and is unquestionably its complement in geographical character.

II. From the consideration of Slavery in its practical results, illustrated by the contrast between the Free States and Slave States, I pass now to another stage of the argument, and proceed to exhibit Slavery in its influence on the **CHARACTER OF SLAVE-MASTERS**. Nothing could I undertake more painful, and yet there is nothing which is more essential to the discussion, especially in response to the pretensions of Senators on this floor, nor is there any point on which the evidence is more complete.

It is in the Character of Slavery itself that we are to find the Character of Slave-masters; but I need not go back to the golden lips of Chrysostom to learn that "Slavery is the fruit of covetousness, of extravagance, of insatiable

greediness;" for we have already seen that this five-fold enormity is inspired by the single idea of *compelling men to work without wages*. This spirit must naturally appear in the Slave-master. But the eloquent Christian Saint did not disclose the whole truth. Slavery is founded on violence, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kindred violence, sometimes against the defenceless slave, sometimes against the freeman whose indignation is aroused at the outrage. It is founded on brutal and vulgar pretensions, as we have already too clearly seen; of course it can be sustained only by kindred brutality and vulgarity. The denial of all rights in the slave can be sustained only by a disregard of other rights, common to the whole community, whether of the person, of the press, or of speech. Where this exists there can be but one supreme law, to which all other laws, legislative or social, are subordinate, and this is the pretended law of Slavery. All these things must be manifest in Slave-masters, and yet, unconscious of their true condition, they make boasts which reveal still further the unhappy influence. Barbarous standards of conduct are unblushingly avowed. The swagger of a bully is called chivalry; a swiftness to quarrel is called courage; the bludgeon is adopted as the substitute for argument; and assassination is lifted to be one of the Fine Arts. Long ago it was fixed certain that the day which made man a slave "took half his worth away"—words from the ancient harp of Homer, resounding through long generations. Nothing here is said of the human being at the other end of the chain. To aver that on this same day all his worth is taken away might seem inconsistent with exceptions which we gladly recognise; but alas! it is too clear, both from reason and from evidence, that, bad as Slavery is for the Slave, it is worse for the Master.

In making this exposure I am fortified, at the outset, by two classes of authorities, whose testimony it will be difficult to question; the first is American, and founded on personal experience; the second is philosophical, and founded on everlasting truth.

First, *American Authority*; and here I adduce words often quoted, which dropped from the lips of Slave-masters in those better days when, seeing the wrong of Slavery, they escaped from its injurious influence. Of these, none expressed themselves with more vigor than Colonel Mason, a Slave-master from Virginia, in debate on the adoption of the National Constitution. These are his words:

"Slavery discourages arts and manufactures. The poor despise labor when performed by slaves. They prevent the emigration of whites, who really enrich and strengthen a country. *They produce the most pernicious effect on manners*. EVERY MASTER OF SLAVES IS BORN A PETTY TYRANT. They bring the judgment of Heaven on a country."

Thus, with a few touches, does this Slave-master portray his class, putting them in that hateful list, which, according to every principle

of liberty, must be resisted so long as we obey God. And this same testimony also found expression from the fiery soul of Jefferson. Here are some of his words:

"There must be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of Slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions, the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissiveness on the other; our children see this, and learn to imitate it. \* \* \* *The man must be a prodigy who can retain his manners and morals unspoiled by such circumstances*. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other! \* \* \* With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed."

Next comes the *Philosophic Authority*; and here the language which I quote may be less familiar, but it is hardly less commanding. Among names of such weight, I shall not discriminate, but shall simply follow the order of time in which they appeared. First is John Locke, the great author of the English System of Intellectual Philosophy, who, though once unhappily conceding indulgence to American Slavery, in another place describes it, in words which every Slave-master should know, as—

"The state of war continued between a lawful conqueror and his captive. \* \* \* So opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that *it is hardly to conceive that an Englishman, much less a Gentleman, should plead for it*."

Then comes Adam Smith, the founder of the science of Political Economy, who, in his work on *Morals*, thus utters himself:

"There is not a negro from the coast of Africa who does not possess a degree of magnanimity which the soul of his master is too often uncapable of conceiving. Fortune never exerted more cruelly her empire over mankind, than when she subjected these nations of heroes to the refuse of gaols of Europe, to wretches who possess the virtues neither of the countries which they come from, nor of those which they go to, and whose levity, brutality, and baseness, so justly expose them to the contempt of the vanquished."—*Theory of Moral Sentiments, Part V, chapter 2*

This judgment, pronounced just a century ago, was repelled by the Slave-masters of Virginia, in a feeble publication which attests at least their own consciousness that they were the criminals arraigned by the distinguished philosopher. This was soon followed by the testimony of the great English moralist, Dr. Johnson, who, in a letter to a friend, thus shows his opinion of Slave-masters:

"To omit for a year, or for a day, the most efficacious method of advancing Christianity, in compliance with any purposes, that terminate on this side of the grave, is a crime of which I know not that the world has had an example, except in the practice of the planters of America, a race of mortals whom, I suppose, no other man wishes to resemble."—*Letter to William Drummond, 13th August, 1766. (Boswell's Life of Johnson, by Croker.)*

With such authorities, American and Philosophic, I need not hesitate in this ungracious task; but Truth, which is mightier than Mason and Jefferson, than John Locke, Adam Smith, and Samuel Johnson, marshals the evidence in unbroken succession.

Proceeding with this argument, which broadens as we advance, we shall see Slave-masters

(1) in the Law of Slavery, (2) in their relations with Slaves, (3) in their relations with each other and with Society, and (4) in that unconsciousness which renders them insensible to their true character.

(1.) As in considering the Character of Slavery, so in considering the Character of Slave-masters, we must begin with the *Law of Slavery*, which, as their work, testifies against them. In the face of such an unutterable abomination, where impiety, cruelty, brutality, and robbery, all strive for mastery, it is in vain to assert the humanity or refinement of its authors. Full well I know that the conscience which speaks so powerfully to the solitary soul, is often silent in the corporate body, and that, in all ages and countries, numbers, when gathered in communities and States, have sanctioned acts from which the individual revolts. And yet I know no surer way of judging a people than by its laws, especially where those laws have been long continued and openly maintained.

Whatever may be the eminence of individual virtue—and I would not so far disparage humanity as to suppose that the offences which may be general where Slavery exists are universal—it is not reasonable or logical to infer that the masses of Slave-masters are better than the Law of Slavery. And since the Law itself degrades the slave to be a chattel, and submits him to their irresponsible control, with power to bind and to scourge; to usurp the fruits of another's labor; to pollute the body; and to outrage all ties of family, making marriage impossible—we must conclude that such enormities are sanctioned by Slave-masters, while the exclusion of testimony, and prohibition of instruction—by supplementary law—complete the evidence of their complicity. And this conclusion must stand unquestioned just so long as the Law of Slavery exists unrepealed. Cease, then, to blazon the humanity of Slave-masters. Tell me not of the lenity with which this cruel Code is tempered to its unhappy subjects. Tell me not of the sympathy which overflows from the mansion of the master to the cabin of the slave. In vain you assert such "happy accidents." In vain you show that there are individuals who do not exert the wickedness of the law. The Barbarism still endures, solemnly, legislatively, judicially attested in the very *SLAVE CODE*, and proclaims constantly the character of its authors. And this is the first article in the evidence against Slave-masters.

(2.) I am next brought to *Slave-masters in their relations with Slaves*; and here the argument is founded upon facts, and upon presumptions irresistible as facts. Only lately has inquiry burst into that gloomy world of bondage, and disclosed its secrets. But enough is already known to arouse the indignant condemnation of mankind. For instance, here is a simple ad-

vertisement—one of thousands—from the *Georgia Messenger*:

"RUN AWAY—My man Fountain; has holes in his ears, a scar on the right side of his forehead; has been shot in the hind parts of his legs; is marked on his back with the whip. Apply to Robert Beasley, Macon, Ga."

Holes in the ears; scar on the forehead; shot in the legs, and marks of the lash on the back! Such are the tokens by which a Slave-master proposes to identify his slave.

And here is another advertisement, revealing Slave-masters in a different light. It is from the *National Intelligencer*, published at the Capital; and I confess the pain with which I cite such an indecency in a journal of such respectability. Of course, it appeared without the knowledge of the editors; but it is none the less an illustrative example:

"FOR SALE.—An accomplished and handsome lady's maid. She is just sixteen years of age; was raised in a genteel family in Maryland; and is now proposed to be sold, not for any fault, but simply because the owner has no further use for her. A note directed to C. D. Gadsby's Hotel, will receive prompt attention."

A sated libertine, in a land where vice is legalized, could not expose his victim with apter words.

These two instances will illustrate a class.

In the recent work of Mr. Olmstead, a close observer and traveller in the Slave States which abounds in pictures of Slavery, expressed with caution, and evident regard to truth, will be found still another, where a Slave-master thus frankly confesses his experience:

"I can tell you how you can break a nigger of running away, certain," said the Slave-master. "There was an old fellow I used to know in Georgia, that always cured his so. If a nigger ran away, when he caught him, he would bind his knee over a log, and fas en him so he couldn't stir; then he'd take a pair of pincers, and pull one of his toe-nails out by the roots; and tell him that if he ever run away again, he would pull out two of them; and if he run away again after that, he told him he'd pull out four of them, and so on, doubling each time. He never had to do it more than twice; it always cured them."—*Olmstead's Texas Journey*, 105.

Like this story, which is from the lips of a Slave-master, is another, where the master, angry because his slave had sought to regain his God-given liberty, deliberately cut the tendons of his heel, thus horribly maiming him for life!

It is in vain that these instances are denied. Their accumulating number, authenticated in every possible manner, by the press, by a cloud of witnesses, and by the confession of Slave-masters, stares us constantly in the face.

And here we are brought again to the slave code, under the shelter of which these and worse things may be done, with complete impunity. Listen to the remarkable words of Chief Justice Ruffin, of North Carolina, who, in a solemn decision, thus portrays, affirms, and deplores, this terrible latitude:

"The obedience of the slave," he says, "is the consequence only of uncontrolled authority over the body. \* \* \* The power of the master must be absolute to render the submission of the slave perfect. I must freely confess my sense of the harshness of this proposition. I feel it as deeply as any man can. And, as a principle of moral right, every person in his retirement must repudiate it. But, in the actual condition of things, it must be so. There is no

remedy. This discipline belongs to the state of Slavery. It is inherent in the relation of master and slave."—*The State v. Mann, 2 Derveaux R. 292.*

And this same terrible latitude has been thus expounded in a recent judicial decision of Virginia:

"It is the policy of the law in respect to the relation of master and slave, and for the sake of securing proper subordination and obedience on the part of the slave, to protect the master from prosecution, even if the whipping and punishment be malicious, cruel, and excessive."—*Sawyer v. Court, 7 Grattan, 673.*

Can Barbarism further go? Here is an irresponsible power, rendered more irresponsible still by the seclusion of the plantation, and absolutely fortified by the supplementary law excluding the testimony of slaves. That under its shelter enormities should occur, stranger than fiction, too terrible for imagination, and surpassing any individual experience, is simply according to the course of nature and the course of history. The visitation of the abbeys in England disclosed vice and disorder in startling forms, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of monastic life. A similar visitation of plantations, would disclose more fearful results, cloaked by the irresponsible privacy of Slavery. Every Slave-master on his plantation is a Bashaw, with all the prerogatives of a Turk. According to Hobbes, he is "a petty king." This is true; and every plantation is of itself a petty kingdom, with more than the immunities of an abbey. Six thousand skulls of infants are said to have been taken from a single fish-pond near a nunnery, to the dismay of Pope Gregory. Under the law of Slavery, infants the offspring of masters "who dream of Freedom in a slave's embrace," are not thrown into a fish-pond, but something worse is done. They are sold. But this is only a single glimpse. Slavery, in its recesses, is another Bastile, whose horrors will never be known until it all is razed to the ground; it is the dismal castle of Giant Despair, which, when captured by the Pilgrims, excited their wonder, as they saw "the dead bodies that lay here and there in the castle-yard, and how full of dead men's bones the dungeon was." The recorded horrors of Slavery seem to be infinite, and each day, by the escape of its victims, they are still further attested, while the door of the vast prison-house is left ajar. But, alas! unless the examples of history and the lessons of political wisdom are alike delusive, its unrecorded horrors must assume a form of yet more fearful dimensions, as we try to contemplate them. Baffling all attempts at description, they sink into that chapter of Sir Thomas Browne, entitled, *Of some Relations whose Truth we fear*; and among kindred things whereof, according to this eloquent philosopher, there remains no register but that of hell.

If this picture of the relations of Slave-masters with their slaves could receive any further darkness, it would be by introducing the figures of the congenial agents through which

the Barbarism is maintained; the Slave-overseer, the Slave-breeder, and the Slave-hunter, each without a peer except in his brother, and the whole constituting the triumvirate of Slavery, in whom its essential brutality, vulgarity, and grossness, are all embodied. There is the Slave-overseer, with his bloody lash, fitly described in his Life of Patrick Henry by Mr. Wirt, who, born in Virginia, knew the class, as "last and lowest, most abject, degraded, unprincipled," and his hands wield at will the irresponsible power. There is the Slave-breeder, who assumes a higher character, and even enters legislative halls, where, in unconscious insensibility, he shocks civilization by denying, like Mr. Gholson, of Virginia, any alleged distinction between the "female slave" and "the brood mare," by openly asserting the necessary respite from work during the gestation of the female slave as the ground of property in her offspring, and by proclaiming that in this "viginial" crop of human flesh consists much of the wealth of his State, while another Virginian, not yet hardened to this debasing trade, whose annual sacrifice reaches 25,000 human souls, confesses the indignation and shame with which he beholds his State "converted into one grand menagerie, where men are reared for the market, like oxen for the shambles." And lastly there is the Slave-hunter, with the blood-hound as his brutal symbol, who pursues slaves, as the hunter pursues game, and does not hesitate in the public prints to advertise his Barbarism thus:

"BLOOD-HOUNDS.—I have TWO of the FINEST DOGS for CATCHING NEGROES in the Southwest. They can take the trail TWELVE HOURS after the NEGRO HAS PASSED, and catch him with ease. I live four miles southwest of Bolivar, on the road leading from Bolivar to Whitesville. I am ready at all times to catch runaway negroes." DAVID TURNER.

"March 2 1853.—*West Tennessee Democrat.*

The blood-hound was known in early Scottish history; it was once vindictively put upon the trail of Robert Bruce, and in barbarous days, by a cruel license of war, it was directed against the marauders of the Scottish border; but more than a century has passed since the last survivor of the race, kept as a curiosity, was fed on meal in Ettrick Forest.\* The blood-hound was employed by Spain, against the natives of this continent, and the eloquence of Chatham never touched a truer chord than when, gathering force from the condemnation of this brutality, he poured his thunder upon the kindred brutality of the scalping-knife, adopted as an instrument of war by a nation professing civilization. Tardily introduced into our Republic, some time after the Missouri Compromise, when Slavery became a political passion and Slave-masters began to throw aside all disguise, the blood-hound has become the representative of our Barbarism in one of its worst forms, when engaged in the pursuit of a fellow-man who is asserting his inborn title to himself;

\* Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel—Notes, Canto V.

and this brute is, indeed, typical of the whole brutal leash of Slave-hunters, who, whether at home on Slave-soil, under the name of Slave-catchers, and kidnappers, or at a distance, under politer names, insult Human Nature by the enforcement of this Barbarism.

(3.) From this dreary picture of Slave-masters with their slaves and their triumvirate of vulgar instruments, I pass to another more dreary still, and more completely exposing the influence of Slavery; I mean the *relations of Slave-masters with each other, also with Society and Government*, or, in other words, the Character of Slave-masters, as displayed in the general relations of life. And here I need your indulgence. Not in triumph or in taunt do I approach this branch of the subject. Yielding only to the irresistible exigency of the discussion and in direct response to the assumptions on this floor, especially by the Senator from Virginia, [Mr. MASON,] I shall proceed. If I touch Slavery to the quick, and enable Slave-masters to see themselves as others see them, I shall do nothing beyond the strictest line of duty in this debate.

One of the choicest passages of the master Italian poet, Dante, is where a scene of transcendent virtue is described as sculptured in "visible speech" on the long gallery which led to the Heavenly Gate. The poet felt the inspiration of the scene, and placed it on the way side, where it could charm and encourage. This was natural. Nobody can look upon virtue and justice, if it be only in images and pictures, without feeling a kindred sentiment. Nobody can be surrounded by vice and wrong, by violence and brutality, if it be only in images and pictures, without coming under their degrading influence. Nobody can live with the one without advantage; nobody can live with the other without loss. Who could pass his life in the secret chamber where are gathered the impure relics of Pompeii, without becoming indifferent to loathsome things? But if these loathsome things are not merely sculptured and painted, if they exist in living reality—if they enact their hideous capers in life, as in the criminal pretensions of Slavery—while the lash plays and the blood spirts—while women are whipped and children are sold—while marriage is polluted and annulled—while the parental tie is rudely torn—while honest gains are filched or robbed—while the soul itself is shut down in all the darkness of ignorance, and while God himself is defied in the pretension that man can have property in his fellow man; if all these things are present, not merely in images and pictures, but in reality, their influence on character must be incalculable.

It is according to irresistible law that men are fashioned by what is about them, whether climate, scenery, life, or institutions. Like produces like, and this ancient proverb is

verified always. Look at the miner, delving low down in darkness, and the mountaineer, ranging on airy heights, and you will see a contrast in character, and even in personal form. The difference between a coward and a hero may be traced in the atmosphere which each has breathed; and how much more in the institutions under which each has been reared. If institutions generous and just ripen souls also generous and just, then other institutions must exhibit their influence also. Violence, brutality, injustice, barbarism, must be reproduced in the lives of all who live within their fatal sphere. The meat that is eaten by man enters into and becomes a part of his body; the madder which is eaten by a dog changes his bones to red; and the Slavery on which men live, in all its five-fold foulness, must become a part of themselves, discoloring their very souls, blotting their characters, and breaking forth in moral leprosy. This language is strong; but the evidence is even stronger. Some there may be of happy natures—like honorable Senators—who can thus feed and not be harmed. Mithridates fed on poison, and lived; and it may be that there is a moral Mithridates, who can swallow without bane the poison of Slavery.

Instead of "ennobling" the master, nothing can be clearer than that the slave drags his master down, and this process begins in childhood, and is continued through life. Living much in association with his slave, the master finds nothing to remind him of his own deficiencies, to prompt his ambition or excite his shame. Without these provocations to virtue, and without an elevating example, he naturally shares the Barbarism of the society which he keeps. Thus the very inferiority which the Slave-master attributes to the African race explains the melancholy condition of the communities in which his degradation is declared by law.

A single false principle or vicious thought may degrade a character otherwise blameless; and this is practically true of the Slave-master. Accustomed to regard men as property, his sensibilities are blunted and his moral sense is obscured. He consents to acts from which Civilization recoils. The early Church sold its property, and even its sacred vessels, for the redemption of captives. This was done on a remarkable occasion by St. Ambrose, and successive canons confirmed the example. But in the Slave States this is all reversed. Slaves there are often sold as the property of the Church, and an instance is related of a slave sold in South Carolina in order to buy plate for the communion table. Who can calculate the effect of such an example?

Surrounded by pernicious influences of all kinds, both positive and negative, the first making him do that which he ought not to do, and the second making him leave undone that which he ought to have done—through child-

hood, youth, and manhood, even unto age—unable while at home to escape these influences, overshadowed constantly by the portentous Barbarism about him, the Slave-master naturally adopts the bludgeon, the revolver, and the bowie-knife. Through these he governs his plantation, and secretly armed with these he enters the world. These are his congenial companions. To wear these is his pride; to use them becomes a passion, almost a necessity. Nothing contributes to violence so much as the wearing of the instruments of violence, thus having them always at hand to obey the lawless instincts of the individual. A barbarous standard is established; a duel is not dishonorable; a contest peculiar to our Slave-masters, known as a "street fight," is not shameful; and modern imitators of Cain have a mark set upon them, not for reproach and condemnation, but for compliment and approval. I wish to keep within bounds; but unanswerable facts, accumulating in fearful quantities, attest that the social system, so much vaunted by honorable Senators, and which we are now asked to sanction and to extend, takes its character from this spirit, and with professions of Christianity on the lips, becomes Cain like. And this is aggravated by the prevailing ignorance in the Slave States, where one in twelve of the adult white population is unable to read and write.

The boldest they who least partake the light,  
As game cocks in the dark are trained to fight.

Of course there are exceptions, which we all gladly recognise, but it is this spirit which predominates and gives the social law. And here mark an important difference. Elsewhere violence shows itself in *spite* of law, whether social or statute; in the Slave States it is *because* of law both social and statute. Elsewhere it is pursued and condemned; in the Slave States it is adopted and honored. Elsewhere it is hunted as a crime; in the Slave States it takes its place among the honorable graces of society.

Let not these harsh statements stand on my authority. Listen to the testimony of two Governors of Slave States in their messages to the Legislatures:

"We long to see the day," said the Governor of Kentucky in 1837, "when the law will assert its majesty, and stop the wanton destruction of life which almost *daily* occurs within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth. *Men slaughter each other with almost perfect impunity.* A species of common law has grown up in Kentucky, which, were it written down, would, in all civilized countries, cause it to be rechristened, in derision, *the land of blood.*"

Such was the official confession of a Slave-master Governor of Kentucky. And here is the official confession made the same year by the Slave-master Governor of Alabama:

"We hear of homicides in different parts of the State continually, and yet have few convictions, and still fewer executions! Why do we hear of *stabblings and shootings almost daily* in some part or other of our State?"

A land of blood! Stabbings and shootings almost daily! Such is the official language. It was natural that contemporary newspapers should repeat what thus found utterance in

high places. Here is a confession by a newspaper in Mississippi:

"The moral atmosphere in our State appears to be in a *deleterious and sanguinary condition.* Almost every exchange paper which reaches us, contains some *inhuman and revolting case of murder or death by violence.*"—*Grand Gulf Advertiser*, 27th June, 1837.

Here is another confession by a newspaper in New Orleans:

"In view of the crimes which are daily committed, we are led to inquire whether it is owing to the inefficiency of our laws, or to the manner in which these laws are administered, that *this frightful deluge of human blood flows through our streets and our places of public resort.*"—*New Orleans Bee*, 23d May, 1838.

And here is testimony of a different character:

"No one who has not been *an integral part of a slaveholding community* can have any idea of its abominations. It is a whitened sepulchre, full of dead men's bones and all uncleanness."

These are the words of a Southern lady, the daughter of the accomplished Judge Grimké of South Carolina.

A catalogue of affrays between politicians, commonly known as "street fights"—I use the phrase which comes from the land of Slavery—would show that these authorities were not mistaken. That famous Dutch picture, admired particularly by a successful engraving, and called the *Knife-fight*, presents a scene less revolting than one of these. Two or more men, armed to the teeth, meet in the streets, at a court-house or a tavern, shoot at each other with revolvers, then gash each other with knives, close, and roll upon the ground, covered with dirt and blood, struggling and stabbing till death, prostration, or surrender, puts an end to the conflict. Each instance tells a shameful story, and cries out against the social system which can tolerate such Barbarism. A catalogue of duels in our country would testify again to the reckless disregard of life where Slavery exists, and would exhibit Violence flaunting in the garb of Honor, and prating of a barbarous code disowned equally by reason and religion. But you have already supped too full of horrors, and I hasten on.

Pardon me if I stop for one moment to exhibit and denounce the Duel. I do it only because it belongs to the brood of Slavery. An enlightened Civilization has long ago rejected this relic of Barbarism, and never has one part of the argument against it been put more sententiously than by Franklin: "A duel decides nothing," said this patriot philosopher, "and the person appealing to it makes himself judge in his own cause, condemns the offender without a jury, and undertakes himself to be the executioner." To these emphatic words I would add two brief propositions, which, if practically adopted, make the Duel impossible—first, that the acknowledgment of wrong with apology or explanation can never be otherwise than honorable; and, secondly, that, in the absence of all such acknowledgment, no wrong can ever be repaired by a gladiatorial contest, where brute force, or skill, or chance, must de-

cide the day. Iron and adamant are not stronger than these arguments; nor can any one attempt an answer without exposing his feebleness. And yet Slave-masters, disregarding its irrational character—insensible to its folly—heedless of its impiety—and unconscious of its Barbarism, openly adopt the Duel as a regulator of manners and conduct. Two voices from South Carolina have been raised against it, and I mention them with gladness as testimony even in that land of Slavery. The first was Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who in the early days of the Republic openly declared his "abhorrence of the practice," and invoked the clergy of his State "as a particular favor at some convenient early day to preach a sermon on the sin and folly of duelling." The other was Mr. Rhett, who on this floor openly declared as his reason for declining the Duel, "that he feared God more than man." Generous words, for which many errors can be pardoned. But these voices condemn the social system of which the Duel is a natural product.

Looking now at the broad surface of society where Slavery exists, we shall find its spirit actively manifest in the suppression of all freedom of speech or of the press, especially with regard to this wrong. Nobody in the Slave States can speak or print against Slavery, except at the peril of life or liberty. St. Paul could call upon the people of Athens to give up the worship of unknown gods; he could live in his own hired house at Rome, and preach Christianity in this Heathen metropolis; but no man can be heard against Slavery in Charleston or Mobile. We condemn the Inquisition, which subjects all within its influence to censorship and secret judgment; but this tyranny is repeated in American Slave-masters. Truths as simple as the great discovery of Galileo are openly denied, and all who declare them are driven to recant. We condemn the Index Expurgatorius of the Roman Church; but American Slave-masters have an Index on which are inscribed all the generous books of the age. There is one book, the marvel of recent literature, Uncle Tom's Cabin, which has been thus treated both by the Church and by the Slave-masters, so that it is honored by the same suppression at the Vatican and at Charleston.

Not to dwell on these instances, there is one which has a most instructive ridiculousness. A religious discourse of the late Dr. Channing on West India Emancipation—the last effort of his beautiful career—was offered for sale by a book agent at Charleston. A prosecution by the South Carolina Association ensued, and the agent was held to bail in the sum of one thousand dollars. Shortly afterwards, the same agent received for sale a work by Dickens, freshly published, "American Notes;" but, determined not to expose himself again to the tyrannical Inquisition, he gave notice through the newspapers that the book "would be sub-

mitted to highly intelligent members of the South Carolina Association for *inspection*, and if the sale is approved by them, it will be for sale—if not, not."

Listen also to another recent instance, as recounted in the *Montgomery Mail*, a newspaper of Alabama :

"Last Saturday we devoted to the flames a large number of copies of Spurgeon's Sermons, and the pile was graced at the top with a copy of "Graves's Great Iron Wheel," which a Baptist friend presented for the purpose. We trust that the works of the greasy cockney vociferator may receive the same treatment throughout the South. And if the Pharisaical author should ever show himself in these parts, we trust that a stout cord may speedily find its way around his eloquent throat. He has proved himself a dirty, low-bred slanderer, and ought to be treated accordingly."

And very recently we have read in the journals, that the trustees of a College in Alabama have resolved that Dr. Wayland's admirable work on Moral Science "contains abolition doctrine of the deepest dye;" and they proceeded to denounce "the said book, and forbid its further use in the Institute."

The speeches of Wilberforce in the British Parliament, and especially those magnificent efforts of Brougham, where he exposed "the wild and guilty fantasy that man can hold property in man," were insanely denounced by the British planters in the West Indies; but our Slave-masters go further. Speeches delivered in the Senate have been stopped at the Post-office; booksellers who had received them have been mobbed, and on at least one occasion the speeches have been solemnly proceeded against by a Grand Jury.

All this is natural, for tyranny is condemned to be consequent with itself. Proclaim Slavery to be a permanent institution, instead of a temporary Barbarism, soon to pass away, and then, by the unhesitating logic of self-preservation, all things must yield to its support. The safety of Slavery becomes the supreme law. And since Slavery is endangered by liberty in any form, therefore all liberty must be restrained. Such is the philosophy of this seeming paradox in a Republic. And our Slave-masters show themselves apt in this work. Violence and brutality are their ready instruments, quickened always by the wakefulness of suspicion, and perhaps often by the restlessness of uneasy conscience. Everywhere in the Slave States the Lion's Mouth of Venice, where citizens were anonymously denounced, is open; nor are the gloomy prisons and the Bridge of Sighs wanting.

This spirit has recently shown itself with such intensity and activity as to constitute what has been properly termed a reign of terror. Northern men, unless they happen to be delegates to a Democratic Convention, are exposed in their travels, whether of business or health, to the operation of this system. They are watched and dogged, as if in a land of Despotism; they are treated with the meanness of a disgusting tyranny, and live in peril always of personal indignity, and often of life and

limb. Complaint has sometimes been made of the wrongs to American citizens in Mexico; but during the last year, more outrages on American citizens have been perpetrated in the Slave States than in Mexico. Here, again, I have no time for details, which have been already presented in other quarters. But the instances are from all conditions of life. In Missouri, a Methodist clergyman, suspected of being an Abolitionist, was taken to prison, amidst threats of tar and feathers. In Arkansas, a schoolmaster was driven from the State. In Kentucky, a plain citizen from Indiana, on a visit to his friends, was threatened with death by the rope. In Alabama, a simple person from Connecticut, peddling books, was thrust into prison, amidst cries of "Shoot him! hang him!" In Virginia, a Shaker, from New York, peddling garden seeds, was forcibly expelled from the State. In Georgia, a merchant's clerk, Irishman by birth, who simply asked the settlement of a just debt, was cast into prison, robbed of his pocket-book, containing nearly \$100, and barely escaped with his life. In South Carolina, a stone-cutter, Irishman by birth, was stripped naked, and then, amidst cries of "Brand him!" "Burn him!" "Spike him to death!" scourged so that blood came at every stroke, while tar was poured upon his lacerated flesh. These atrocities, calculated, according to the words of a poet of subtle beauty, to "make a holiday in hell," were all ordained, by Vigilance Committees, or by that busiest magistrate, Judge Lynch, inspired by the demon of Slavery.

"He let them loose, and cried, Halloo!  
How shall we yield him honor due?"

In perfect shamelessness, and as if to blazon this fiendish spirit, we have had, this winter, in a leading newspaper of Virginia, an article, proposing to give twenty-five dollars each for the heads of citizens, mostly members of Congress, known to be against Slavery, and \$50,000 for the head of William H. Seward. And in still another paper of Virginia, we find a proposition to raise \$10,000 to be given for the kidnapping and delivery of a venerable citizen, Joshua R. Giddings, at Richmond, "or \$5,000 for the production of his head." These are fresh instances, but they are not alone. At a meeting of Slave-masters in Georgia, in 1835, the Governor was recommended to issue a proclamation, offering \$5,000 as a reward for the apprehension of either of ten persons named in the resolution, citizens of New York and Massachusetts, and one a subject of Great Britain—not one of whom it was pretended had ever set foot on the soil of Georgia. The Milledgeville *Federal Union*, a newspaper of Georgia, in 1836, contained an offer of \$10,000 for kidnapping a clergyman residing in the city of New York. A Committee of Vigilance of Louisiana, in 1835, offered, in the *Louisiana Journal*, \$50,000 to any person who would deliver into their hands Arthur Tappan, a mer-

chant of New York; and, during the same year, a public meeting in Alabama, with a person entitled "Honorable" in the chair, offered a similar reward of \$50,000 for the apprehension of the same Arthur Tappan, and of La Roy Sunderland, a clergyman of the Methodist church at New York.

These manifestations are not without prototype in the history of the Anti-Slavery cause in other countries. From the beginning, Slave-masters have encountered argument by brutality and violence. If we go back to the earliest of Abolitionists, the wonderful Portuguese preacher, Vieyra, we shall find that his matchless eloquence and unquestioned piety did not save him from indignity. After a sermon exposing Slavery in Brazil, he was seized and imprisoned, while one of the principal Slave-masters asked him, in mockery, where were all his learning and all his genius now, if they could not deliver him in this extremity? He was of the Catholic church. But the spirit of Slavery is the same in all churches. A renowned Quaker minister of the last century, Thomas Chalkley, while on a visit at Barbados, having simply recommended charity to the slaves, without presuming to breathe a word against Slavery itself, was first met by disturbance in the meeting, and afterwards, on the highway, and in open day, was fired at by one of the exasperated planters, with "a fowling-piece loaded with small shot, ten of which made marks, and several drew blood." Even in England, while the slave trade was under discussion, the same spirit appeared. Wilberforce, who represented the cause of Abolition in Parliament, was threatened with personal violence; Clarkson, who represented the same cause before the people, was assaulted by the infuriate Slave-traders, and narrowly escaped being hustled into the dock; and Roscoe, the accomplished historian, on his return to Liverpool from his seat in Parliament, where he had signalized himself as an opponent of the slave trade, was met at the entrance of the town by a savage mob, composed of persons interested in this traffic, armed with *knives and bludgeons*, the distinctive arguments and companions of Pro Slavery partisans.

And even in the Free States the partisans of Slavery have from the beginning acted under the inspiration of violence. The demon of Slavery has entered into them, and under its influence they have behaved like Slave-masters. Public meetings for the discussion of Slavery have been interrupted; public halls dedicated to its discussion have been destroyed or burned to the ground. In all our populous cities the great rights of speech and of the press have been assailed precisely as in the Slave States. In Boston, Garrison, pleading for the Slave, was dragged through the streets with a halter about his neck, and in Illinois Lovejoy, also pleading for the Slave, was ferociously murdered. The former yet lives to speak for himself, while

the latter lives in his eloquent brother, the Representative from Illinois in the other House. Thus does Slavery show its natural influence even at a distance.

Nor in the Slave States is this spirit confined to the outbreaks of mere lawlessness. Too strong for restraint, it finds no limitations except in its own barbarous will. The Government becomes its tool, and in *official acts* does its bidding. Here again the instances are numerous. I might dwell on the degradation of the Post Office, when its official head consented that, for the sake of Slavery, the mails themselves should be rifled. I might dwell also on the cruel persecution of Free Persons of color who in the Slave States generally, and even here in the District of Columbia, are not allowed to testify where a white man is in question, and who now in several States are menaced by legislative act with the alternative of expulsion from their homes or of reduction to Slavery. But I pass at once to two illustrative transactions, which, as a son of Massachusetts, I cannot forget.

1. The first relates to a citizen, of purest life and perfect integrity, whose name is destined to fill a conspicuous place in the history of Freedom, William Lloyd Garrison. Born in Massachusetts, bred to the same profession with Benjamin Franklin, and like his great predecessor becoming an editor, he saw with instinctive clearness the wrong of Slavery, and at a period when the ardors of the Missouri Question had given way to indifference throughout the North, he stepped forward to denounce it. The jail at Baltimore, where he then resided, was his earliest reward. Afterwards, January 1st, 1831, he published the first number of the *Liberator*, inscribing for his motto an utterance of Christian philanthropy, "My country is the world, my countrymen are all mankind," and declaring in the face of surrounding apathy, "I am in earnest. I will not equivocate, I will not retreat a single inch, and I will be heard." In this sublime spirit he commenced his labors for the Slave, proposing no intervention by Congress in the States, and on well-considered principle avoiding all appeals to the bondmen themselves. Such was his simple and thoroughly constitutional position, when, before the expiration of the first year, the Legislature of Georgia, by solemn act, a copy of which I have now before me, "approved" by Wilson Lumpkin, Governor, appropriated \$5,000 "to be paid to any person who shall arrest, bring to trial, and prosecute to conviction under the laws of this State, the editor or publisher of a certain paper called the *Liberator*, published at the town of Boston and State of Massachusetts." This infamous legislative act touching a person absolutely beyond the jurisdiction of Georgia, and in no way amenable to its laws, constituted a plain bribe to the gangs of kidnappers engendered by Slavery. With this barefaced defiance of justice and decency Slave-masters inaugurated the system of

violence by which they have sought to crush every voice that has been raised against Slavery.

2. Here is another illustration of a different character. Free persons of color, citizens of Massachusetts, and, according to the institutions of this Commonwealth, entitled to equal privileges with other citizens, being in service as mariners, and touching at the port of Charleston, in South Carolina, have been seized, and with no allegation against them, except of entering this port in the discharge of their rightful business, have been cast into prison, and there detained during the delay of the vessel. This is by virtue of a statute of South Carolina, passed in 1823, which further declares, that in the failure of the captain to pay the expenses, these freemen "shall be seized and taken as absolute slaves," one moiety of the proceeds of their sale to belong to the Sheriff. Against all remonstrance—against the official opinion of Mr. Wirt, as Attorney General of the United States, declaring it unconstitutional—against the solemn judgment of Mr. Justice Johnson, of the Supreme Court of the United States, himself a Slave-master and citizen of South Carolina, also pronouncing it unconstitutional—this statute, which is an obvious injury to Northern ship-owners, as it is an outrage to the mariners whom it seizes, has been upheld to this day by South Carolina.

But this is not all. Massachusetts, in order to obtain for her citizens that protection which was denied, and especially to save them from the dread penalty of being sold into Slavery, appointed a citizen of South Carolina to act as her agent for this purpose, and to bring suits in the Circuit Court of the United States in order to try the constitutionality of this pretension. Owing to the sensibility of the people in that State, this agent declined to render this simple service. Massachusetts next selected one of her own sons, a venerable citizen, who had already served with honor in the other House of Congress, and who was of admitted eminence as a lawyer, the Hon. Samuel Hoar, of Concord, to visit Charleston, and to do what the agent first appointed had shrunk from doing. This excellent gentleman, beloved by all who knew him, gentle in manners as he was firm in character, and with a countenance that was in itself a letter of recommendation, arrived at Charleston, accompanied only by his daughter. Straightway all South Carolina was convulsed. According to a story in Boswell's Johnson, all the inhabitants at St. Kilda, a remote island of the Hebrides, on the approach of a stranger, "catch cold;" but in South Carolina it is a fever that they "catch." The Governor at the time, who was none other than one of her present Senators, [Mr. HAMMOND,] made his arrival the subject of a special message to the Legislature, which I now have before me; the Legislature all "caught" the fever, and swiftly adopted resolutions calling upon "his Excel-

lency the Governor to expel from its territory the said agent, after due notice to depart," and promising "to sustain the Executive authority in any measures it may adopt for the purposes aforesaid."

Meanwhile the fever raged in Charleston. The agent of Massachusetts was first accosted in the street by a person unknown to him, who, flourishing a bludgeon in his hand—the bludgeon always shows itself where Slavery is in question—cried out, "you had better be travelling, and the sooner the better for you, I can tell you; if you stay here until to-morrow morning, you will feel something you will not like, I'm thinking." Next came threats of an attack during the following night on the Hotel in which he was lodged; then a request from the landlord that he should quit, in order to preserve the Hotel itself from the impending danger of an infuriate mob; then a committee of Slave-masters, who politely proposed to conduct him to the boat. Thus arrested in his simple errand of good will, this venerable public servant, whose appearance alone—like that of the "grave and pious man" mentioned by Virgil—would have softened any mob not inspired by Slavery, yielded to the ejectment proposed—precisely as the prisoner yields to the officers of the law—and left Charleston, while a person in the crowd was heard to offer himself as "the leader of a tar-and-feather gang to be called into the service of the city on the occasion." Nor is this all? The Legislature a second time "caught" the fever, and, yielding to its influence, passed another statute, forbidding under severe penalties any person within the State from accepting a commission to befriend these colored mariners, and under penalties severer still, extending even to imprisonment for life, prohibiting any person "on his own behalf or by virtue of any authority from any State" to come within South Carolina for this purpose; and then, to complete its work, the Legislature took away the writ of *habeas corpus* from all such mariners.

Such is a simple narrative founded on authentic documents. I do not adduce it now for criticism, but simply to enroll it in all its stages—beginning with the earliest pretension of South Carolina, continuing in violence, and ending in yet other pretensions—among the special instances where the Barbarism of Slavery stands confessed even in official conduct. And yet this transaction, which may well give to South Carolina the character of a shore "where shipwrecked mariners dread to land," has been openly vindicated in all its details from beginning to end by both the Senators from that State, while one of them, [Mr. HAMMOND], in the same breath, has borne his testimony from personal knowledge to the character of the public agent thus maltreated, saying, "he was a pleasant, kind, old gentleman, and I had a sort of friendship for him during the short time I sat near him in Congress."

Thus, sir, whether we look at individuals or at the community where Slavery exists, at lawless outbreaks or at official conduct, Slave-masters are always the same. Enough, you will say, has been said. Yes; enough to expose Slavery, but not enough for Truth. The most instructive and most grievous part still remains. It is the exhibition of Slave-masters in Congressional history. Of course, the representative reflects the character as well as the political opinions of the constituents whose will it is his boast to obey. It follows that the passions and habits of Slave-masters are naturally represented in Congress—chastened to a certain extent, perhaps, by the requirements of Parliamentary Law, but breaking out in fearful examples. And here, again, facts shall speak, as nothing else can.

In proceeding with this duty, to which, as you will perceive, I am impelled by the positive requirements of this debate, I crave the indulgence of the Senate, while, avoiding all allusions to private life or private character, and touching simply what is of record, and already "enrolled in the Capitol," I present a few only of many instances, which, especially during these latter days, since Slavery has become paramount, have taken their place in our national history.

Here is an instance. On the 15th February, 1837, R. M. Whitney was arraigned before the House of Representatives for contempt, in refusing to attend, when required, before a Committee of investigation into the administration of the Executive office. His excuse was, that he could not attend without exposing himself thereby to outrage and violence in the committee room; and on examination at the bar of the House, Mr. Fairfield, a member of the Committee, afterwards a member of this body, and Governor of Maine, testified to the actual facts. It appeared that Mr. Peyton, a Slave-master from Tennessee, and a member of the Committee, regarding a certain answer in writing by Mr. Whitney to an interrogatory propounded by him as offensive, broke out in these words: "Mr. Chairman, I wish you to inform this witness, that he is not to insult me in his answers; if he does, God damn him! I will take his life on the spot!" The witness, rising, claimed the protection of the Committee; on which Mr. Peyton exclaimed: "God damn you, you shan't speak; you shan't say one word while you are in this room; if you do, I will put you to death." Mr. Wise, another Slave-master from Virginia, Chairman of the Committee, and latterly Governor of Virginia, then intervened, saying, "Yes, this damned insolence is insufferable." Soon after, Mr. Peyton, observing that the witness was looking at him, cried out, "Damn him, his eyes are on me—God damn him, he is looking at me—he shan't do it—damn him, he shan't look at me."

These things, and much more, disclosed b

Mr. Fairfield in reply to interrogatories in the House, were confirmed by other witnesses, and Mr. Wise himself in a speech made the admission that he was armed with deadly weapons, saying, "I watched the motion of that right arm, [of the witness,] the elbow of which could be seen by me, and had it moved one inch, he had died on the spot. That was my determination."

All this will be found in the 13th volume of the *Congressional Debates*, with the evidence in detail, and the discussion thereupon.

Here is another instance of similar character, which did not occur in a Committee-room, but during debate in the Senate Chamber. While the Compromise measures were under discussion in 1850, on the 17th of April, 1850, Mr. Foote, a Slave-master from Mississippi, in the course of his remarks, commenced a personal allusion to Mr. Benton. This was aggravated by the circumstance that only a few days previously he had made this distinguished gentleman the mark for most bitter and vindictive personalities. Mr. Benton rose at once from his seat, and, with an angry countenance, but without weapons of any kind in his hand, or, as it appeared afterward before the Committee, on his person, advanced in the direction of Mr. Foote, when the latter, gliding backwards, drew from his pocket a five-chambered revolver, full loaded, which he cocked. Meanwhile Mr. Benton, at the suggestion of friends, was already returning to his seat, when he perceived the pistol. Excited greatly by this deadly menace, he exclaimed, "I am not armed. I have no pistols. I disdain to carry arms. Stand out of the way, and let the assassin fire." Mr. Foote remained standing in the position he had taken, with his pistol in his hand, cocked. "Soon after," says the report of the Committee appointed to investigate this occurrence, "both Senators resumed their seats, and order was restored."

All this will be found at length in the 21st volume of the *Congressional Globe*.

Another instance, which belongs to the same class, is given by the Hon. William Jay, a writer of singular accuracy, and of the truest principle, who has done much to illustrate the history of our country. It is this: Mr. Dawson, a Slave-master from Louisiana, and a member of the House of Representatives, went up to another member on the floor of the House, and addressed to him these words: "If you attempt to speak, or rise from your seat, sir, by G—d, I'll cut your throat."

The duel, which at home in the Slave States is "twin" with the "street fight," is also "twin" with these instances. It is constantly adopted or attempted by Slave-masters in Congress. But I shall not enter upon this catalogue. I content myself with showing the openness with which in debate it has been menaced, and without any call to order.

Mr. Foote, the same Slave-master already

mentioned, in debate in the Senate, 26th of March, 1850, thus sought to provoke Mr. Benton. I take his words from the *Congressional Globe*, vol. 21, p. 603:

"There are instances in the history of the Senator which might well relieve a man of honor from the obligation to recognise him as a fitting antagonist; yet it is notwithstanding true, that, if the Senator from Missouri will deign to acknowledge himself responsible to the laws of honor, he shall have a very early opportunity of proving his prowess in contest with one over whom I hold perfect control; or, if he feels in the least degree aggrieved at anything which has fallen from me, he shall, on demanding it, have full redress accorded to him, according to the said laws of honor. I do not denounce him as a coward; such language is unfit for this audience; but if he wishes to patch up his reputation for courage, now greatly on the wane, he will certainly have an opportunity of doing so whenever he makes his desire known in the premises. At present he is shielded by his age, his open disavowal of the obligatory laws of honor, and his Senatorial privileges."

With such bitter taunts and reiterated provocations to the duel was Mr. Benton pursued; but there was no call to order, nor any action of the Senate on this outrage.

Here is another instance. In debate in the Senate on the 27th February, 1852, Mr. Clemens, a Slave-master of Alabama, thus directly attacked Mr. Rhett for undertaking to settle their differences by argument in the Senate, rather than by the duel. "No man," said he, "with the feeling of a man in his bosom, would have sought redress here. He would have looked for it elsewhere. He now comes here not to ask redress in the only way he should have sought it."

There was no call to order.

Here is still another. In the debate of the bill for the improvement of Rivers and Harbors, 29th July, 1854, (*Congressional Globe*, vol. 29, appendix, page 1163,) the Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. BENJAMIN,] who is still a member of this body, ardent for Slavery, while professing to avoid personal altercation in the Senate, especially "with a gentleman who professes the principles of non-resistance, as he understood the Senator from New York does," proceeded most earnestly to repel an imagined imputation on him by Mr. SEWARD, and wound up by saying: "If it came from another quarter, it would not be upon this floor that I should answer it."

And then, during the present session, the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. DAVIS,] who speaks so often for Slavery, in a colloquy on this floor with the Senator from Vermont, [Mr. COLLAMER,] has maintained the Duel as a mode of settling personal differences and vindicating what is called personal honor; as if personal honor did not depend absolutely upon what a man does, and not what is done to him. "A gentleman," says the Senator, "has the right to give an insult, if he feels himself bound to answer for it;" and in reply to the Senator from Vermont, he declared, that in case of insult, taking another out and shooting him might be "satisfaction."

I do not dwell on this instance, nor on any of these instances, except to make a single com-

ment. These declarations have all been made in open Senate, without any check from the Chair. Of course, they are clear violations of the first principles of Parliamentary Law, and tend directly to provoke a violation of the law of the land. All duels are prohibited by solemn act of Congress. (See Statutes at Large, vol. 5, page 318, February 20, 1839.) In case of death, the surviving parties are declared guilty of felony, to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary; and, even where nothing has occurred beyond the challenge, all the parties to it, whether givers or receivers, are declared guilty of high crime and misdemeanor, also to be punished by hard labor in the penitentiary. Of course, every menace of a duel in Congress sets this law at defiance. And yet the Senators, who thus openly disregard a law sanctioned by the Constitution and commended by morality, presume to complain on this floor because other Senators disregard the Fugitive Slave Bill, a statute which, according to the profound convictions of large numbers, is as unconstitutional as it is offensive to the moral sense. Let Senators who are so clamorous for "the enforcement of laws," begin by enforcing the statute which declares the Duel to be a felony. At least, let the statute cease to be a dead letter in this Chamber. But this is too much to expect while Slavery prevails here, for the Duel is a part of that System of Violence which has its origin in Slavery.

But it is when aroused by the Slave Question in Congress that Slave-masters have most truly shown themselves; and here again I shall speak only of what has already passed into history. Even in that earliest debate, in the First Congress after the Constitution, on the memorial of Dr. Franklin, simply calling upon Congress "to step to the verge of its powers to discourage every species of traffic in our fellow-men," the Slave-masters became angry, indulged in sneers at "the men in the gallery," being Quakers and Abolitionists, and, according to the faithful historian, Hildreth, poured out "torrents of abuse," while one of them began the charge so often since directed against all Anti-Slavery men, by declaring his astonishment that Dr. Franklin had "given countenance to an application which called upon Congress, in explicit terms, to break a solemn compact to which he had himself been a party," when it was obvious that Dr. Franklin had done no such thing. This great man was soon summoned away by death, but not until he had fastened upon this debate an undying condemnation, by portraying, with his matchless pen, a scene in the Divan at Algiers, where a corsair Slave-dealer, insisting upon the enslavement of White Christians, is made to repeat the Congressional speech of an American Slave-master.

But these displays of Violence have naturally increased with the intensity of the discussion. Impelled to be severe, but with little appreciation of the finer forms of debate, they

could not be severe except by violating the rules of debate; not knowing that there is a serener power than any found in personalities, and that all severity which transcends the rules of debate, becomes disgusting as the talk of Yahoos, and harms him only who degrades himself to be its mouth-piece. Of course, on such occasions, the cause of Slavery, amidst all seeming triumphs, has lost, and Truth has gained.

It was against John Quincy Adams that this violence was first directed in full force. To a character spotless as snow, and to universal attainments as a scholar, this illustrious citizen added experience in all the eminent posts of the Republic, which he had filled with an ability and integrity, now admitted even by his enemies, and which impartial history cannot forget. Having been President of the United States, he entered the House of Representatives at the period when the Slave Question in its revival first began to occupy the public attention. In all the completeness of his nature, he became the representative of Human Freedom. The first struggle occurred on the right of petition, which Slave-masters, with characteristic tyranny, sought to suppress. This was resisted by the venerable patriot, and what he did was always done with his whole heart. Then was poured upon him abuse *as from a cart*. Slave-masters, "foaming out their shame," became conspicuous, not less for an avowal of sentiments at which Civilization blushed, than for an effrontery of manner where the accidental legislator was lost in the natural overseer, and the lash of the plantation resounded in the voice.

In an address to his constituents, 17th September, 1842, Mr. Adams thus frankly describes the treatment he had experienced:

"I never can take part in any debate upon an important subject, be it only upon a mere abstraction, but a pack opens upon me of personal invective in return. Language has no word of reproach and railing that is not hurled at me."

And in the same speech he gives a glimpse of Slave masters:

"Where the South cannot effect her object by brow-beating, she wheedles."

On another occasion he said, with his accustomed power:

"Insult, bullying, and threat, characterize the Slaveholders in Congress; talk, timidity, and submission, the Representatives from the Free States."

Nor were the Slave-masters contented with the violence of words. True to the instincts of Slavery, they threatened personal indignity of every kind, and even assassination. And here South Carolina naturally took the lead.

The *Charleston Mercury*, which always speaks the true voice of Slavery, said in 1837:

"Public opinion in the South would now, we are sure, justify an immediate resort to force by the Southern delegation, even on the floor of Congress, were they forthwith to seize and drag from the Hall any man who dared to insult them, as that eccentric old showman, John Quincy Adams, has dared to do."

And at a public dinner at Walterborough,

in South Carolina, on the 4th of July, 1842, the following toast, afterwards preserved by Mr. Adams in one of his speeches, was drunk with unbounded applause:

" May we never want a Democrat to trip up the heels of a Federalist, or a hangman to prepare a halter for John Quincy Adams! [Nine cheers.] "

A Slave-master from South Carolina, Mr. Waddy Thompson, in debate in the House of Representatives, threatened the venerable patriot with the "penitentiary;" and another Slave master, Mr. Marshall of Kentucky, insisted that he should be "*silenced*." Ominous word! full of suggestion to the bludgeon-bearers of Slavery. But the great representative of Freedom stood firm. Meanwhile Slavery assumed more and more the port of the giant Maul in the Pilgrim's Progress, who continued with his club breaking the skulls of pilgrims, until he was slain by Mr. Great Heart, making way for the other pilgrims, Mr. Valiant for Truth, Mr. Standfast, and Mr. Honest.

Next to John Quincy Adams, no person in Congress has been more conspicuous for long-continued and patriotic services against Slavery, than Joshua R. Giddings, of Ohio; nor have any such services received in higher degree that homage which is found in the personal and most vindictive assaults of Slave-masters. For nearly twenty years he sat in the House of Representatives, bearing his testimony always loftily, and never shrinking, though exposed to the grossest brutality. In a recent public address at New York, he has himself recounted some of these instances.

On the presentation by him of resolutions affirming that Slavery was a local institution, and could not exist outside of the Slave States, and applying this principle to the case of the Creole, the House "caught" the South Carolina fever. A proposition censuring him was introduced by Slave masters, and pressed to a vote under the operation of the previous question without giving him a moment for explanation, or reply. This glaring outrage upon freedom of debate was redressed at once by the constituency of Mr. Giddings, who returned him again to his seat. From that time the rage of the Slave-masters against him was constant. Here is his own brief account:

" I will not speak of the time when Dawson, of Louisiana, drew a bowie-knife for my assassination. I was afterwards speaking with regard to a certain transaction in which negroes were concerned in Georgia, when Mr. Black, of Georgia, raising his bludgeon, and standing in front of my seat, said to me, ' If you repeat that language again, I will knock you down.' It was a solemn moment for me. I had never been knocked down, and having some curiosity upon that subject, I repeated the language. Then Mr. Dawson, of Louisiana, the same who had drawn the bowie-knife, placed his hand in his pocket and said, with an oath which I will not repeat, that he would shoot me, at the same time cocking the pistol, so that all around me could hear it click."

Listening to these horrors, ancient stories of Barbarism seem all outdone; and the "viper-broth," which was a favorite decoction in a barbarous age, seems to have become the daily drink of American Slave-masters. The blas-

pheming madness of the witches in Macbeth, daacing round the cauldron, and dropping into it "sweltered venom sleeping got," and every other "charm of powerful trouble," was all renewed. But Mr. Giddings, strong in the consciousness of right, knew the dignity of his position. He knew that it is honorable always to serve the cause of Liberty, and that it is a privilege to suffer for this cause. Re-proach, contumely, violence even unto death, are rewards, not punishments; and clearly the indignities which you offer can excite no shame except for their authors.

Besides these eminent instances, others may be mentioned, showing the personalities to which Senators and Representatives have been exposed, when undertaking to speak for Freedom. And truth compels me to add, that there is too much evidence that these have been aggravated by the circumstance that, where persons notoriously rejected an appeal to the Duel, such insults could be offered with impunity.

Here is an instance. In 1848, Mr. HALE, the Senator from New Hamp'-hire, who still continues an honor to this body, introduced into the Senate a bill for the protection of property in the District of Columbia, especially against mob-violence. In the course of the debate that ensued, Mr. Foote, a Slave-master from Mississippi, thus menaced him:

" I invite the Senator to the State of Mississippi, and will tell him beforehand, in all honesty, that he could not go ten miles into the interior before he would grace one of the tallest trees of the forest with a rope around his neck, with the approbation of every virtuous and patriotic citizen, and that, if necessary, *I should myself assist in the operation*."

That this bloody threat may not seem to stand alone, I add two others.

Mr. HAMMOND, of South Carolina, now a Senator, is reported as saying in the House of Representatives:

" I warn the abolitionists, ignorant, infatuated barbarians as they are, that if chance shall throw any of them into our hands, they may expect *a felon's death!*!"

And in 1841, Mr. Payne, a Slave-master from Alabama, in the course of debate in the House of Representatives, alluding to the Abolitionists, among whom he insisted the Postmaster General ought to be included, declared that—

" He would put the brand of Cain upon them—yes, the mark of hell—and if they came to the South, he would *hang them like dogs!*"

And these words were applied to men who simply expressed the recorded sentiments of Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin.

Even during the present session of Congress, I find, in the *Congressional Globe*, the following interruptions of Mr. LOVEJOY, when speaking on Slavery. I do not characterize them; but simply cite them:

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi:

" Order that black-hearted scoundrel and nigger-stealing thief to take his seat."

By Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina, addressing Mr. LOVEJOY:

" Then behave yourself."

By Mr. GARTRELL, of Georgia, (in his seat:)

"The man is crazy."

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi, again:

"No, sir, you stand there to-day an infamous, perjured villain."

By Mr. ASHMORE, of South Carolina:

"Yes; he is a perjured villain, and he perjures himself every hour he occupies a seat on this floor."

By Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi:

"And a negro-thief into the bargain."

By Mr. BARKSDALE, of Mississippi, again:

"I hope my colleague will hold no parley with that perjured negro-thief."

By Mr. SINGLETON, of Mississippi, again:

"No, sir; any gentleman shall have time, but not such a mean, despicable wretch as that!"

By Mr. MARTIN, of Virginia:

"And if you come among us, we will do with you as we did with John Brown—hang you as high as Haman. I say that as a Virginian."

But enough—enough; and I now turn from this branch of the argument with a single remark. While exhibiting the Character of Slave-masters, these numerous instances—and they might be multiplied indefinitely—attest the weakness of their cause. It requires no special talent to estimate the insignificance of an argument that can be supported only by violence. The scholar will not forget the story told by Lucian of the colloquy between Jupiter and a simple countryman. They talked with ease and freedom until they differed, when the angry god at once menaced his honest opponent with a thunder-bolt. "Ah, ah!" said the clown, with perfect composure, "now, Jupiter, I know you are wrong. You are always wrong when you appeal to your thunder." And permit me to say, that every appeal, whether to the Duel, the bludgeon, or the revolver—every menace of personal violence, and every outrage of language, besides disclosing a hideous Barbarism, also discloses the fevered nervousness of a cause already humbled in debate.

(4.) Much as has been said to exhibit the Character of Slave-masters, the work would be incomplete if I failed to point out that *unconsciousness* of the fatal influence of Slavery, which completes the evidence of the Barbarism under which they live. Nor am I at liberty to decline this topic; but I shall be brief.

That Senators should openly declare Slavery "ennobling," at least to the master, and also "the black marble key-stone of our national arch," would excite wonder if it were not explained by the examples of history. There are men who, in the spirit of paradox, make themselves the partisans of a bad cause, as Jerome Cardan wrote an *Encomium on Nero*. But where there is no disposition to paradox, it is natural that a cherished practice should blind those who are under its influence; nor is there any end to these exaggerations. According to Thucydides, piracy in the early ages of Greece was alike widespread and honorable; so much so, that Telemachus and Mentor, on landing

at Mycenæ, were asked by Nestor if they were "pirates"—precisely as a stranger in South Carolina might be asked if he were a Slave-master. Kidnapping, too, which was a kindred indulgence, was openly avowed, and I doubt not held to be "ennobling." Next to the unconsciousness which is noticed in childhood, is the unconsciousness of Barbarism. The real Barbarian is as unconscious as an infant; and the Slave-master shows much of the same character. No New Zealander exults in his tattoo, no savage of the Northwest coast exults in his flat head, more than the Slave-master in these latter days—and always, of course, with honorable exceptions—exults in his unfortunate condition. The Slave-master hugs his disgusting practice as the Carib of the Gulf hugged Cannibalism, and as Brigham Young now hugs Polygamy. The delusion of the "Goitre" is repeated. This prodigious swelling of the neck, constituting "a hideous wallet of flesh" pendulous upon the breast, is common to the population on the slopes of the Alps; but, accustomed to this deformity, the sufferer comes to regard it with pride, as Slave-masters with us regard Slavery, and it is said that those who have no swelling are laughed at and called "goose-necked."

With knowledge comes distrust and the modest consciousness of imperfection; but the pride of Barbarism has no such limitations. It dilates in the thin air of ignorance, and makes boasts. Surely, if these illustrations are not entirely inapplicable, then must we find in the boasts of Slave-masters new occasion to regret the influence of Slavery.

It is this same influence which renders Slave-masters insensible to those characters which are among the true glories of the Republic; which makes them forget that Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, and Washington, who commanded its armies, were Abolitionists; which renders them insensible to the inspiring words of the one, and to the commanding example of the other. Of these great men, it is the praise, well deserving perpetual mention, and only grudged by a malign influence, that reared amidst Slavery, they did not hesitate to condemn it. To the present debate, Jefferson, in repeated utterances, alive with the fire of genius and truth, has contributed the most important testimony for Freedom ever pronounced in this hemisphere, in words equal to the cause, and Washington, often quoted as a Slave-master, in the solemn dispositions of his last Will and Testament, has contributed an example which is beyond even the words of Jefferson. Do not, sir, call him a Slave-master, who entered into the presence of his Maker only as the Emancipator of his slaves. The difference between such men and the Slave-masters whom I expose to-day is so precise that it cannot be mistaken. The first *looked down* upon Slavery; the second *look up* to Slavery. The first, rec-

ognising its wrong, were at once liberated from its pernicious influences, while the latter, upholding it as right and "ennobling," must naturally draw from it motives of conduct. The first, conscious of the character of Slavery, were not misled by it; the second, dwelling in unconsciousness of its true character, surrendered blindly to its barbarous tendencies, and, verifying the words of the poet,

— "So perfect is their misery,  
Not once perceive their foul disfigurement;  
But boast themselves more comely than before."

Mr. President, it is time to close this branch of the argument. The Barbarism of Slavery has been now exposed, first, in the Law of Slavery, with its five pretensions, founded on the assertion of property in man, the denial of the conjugal relation, the infraction of the parental relation, the exclusion from knowledge, and the robbery of the fruits of another's labor, all these having the single object of *compelling men to work without wages*, while its Barbarism was still further attested by tracing the law in its origin to barbarous Africa; and secondly, it has been exposed in a careful examination of the economical results of Slavery, illustrated by a contrast between the Free States and the Slave States, sustained by official figures. From this exposure of Slavery, I proceeded to consider its influences on Slave-masters; whose true character stands confessed, first, in the Law of Slavery which is their work; next, in the relations between them and their slaves, maintained by three inhuman instruments; next, in their relations with each other, and with society, and here we have seen them at home under the immediate influence of Slavery—also in the communities of which they are a part—practicing violence, and pushing it everywhere, in street fight and duel; especially raging against all who question the pretensions of Slavery; entering even into the Free States; but not in lawless outbreaks only; also in official acts, as of Georgia and of South Carolina, with regard to two Massachusetts citizens; and then, ascending in audacity, entering the Halls of Congress, where they have raged as at home, against all who set themselves against their assumptions, while the whole gloomy array of unquestionable facts has been closed by portraying the melancholy unconsciousness which constitutes one of the distinctive features of this Barbarism.

Such is my answer to the assumption of fact in behalf of Slavery by Senators on the other side. But before passing to that other assumption of constitutional law, which constitutes the second branch of this discussion, I add testimony to the influence of Slavery on Slave-masters in other countries, which is too important to be neglected, and may properly find a place here.

Among those who have done most to press forward in Russia that sublime act of emanci-

pation by which the present Emperor is winning lustre, not only for his own country, but for our age, is M. Tourguenoff. Originally a Slave-master himself, with numerous slaves, and residing where Slavery prevailed, he saw, with the instincts of a noble character, the essential Barbarism of this relation, and in an elaborate work on Russia, which is now before me, he exposed it with rare ability and courage. Thus he speaks of its influence on Slave-masters :

" But if Slavery degrades the slave, it degrades more the master. This is an old adage, and long observations have proved to me that this adage is not a paradox. In fact, how can that man respect his own dignity, his own rights, who has learned not to respect either the rights or the dignity of his fellow-man? What control can the moral and religious sentiments have over a man who sees himself invested with a power so eminently contrary to morals and religion? The continual exercise of an unjust claim, even when it is moderated, finishes by corrupting the character of the man, and spoiling his judgment. \* \* \* The possession of a slave being the result of injustice, the relations of the master with the slave cannot be otherwise than a succession of injustices. Among good masters, (and it is agreed to call so those who do not abuse their power as much as they might,) these relations are clothed with forms less repugnant than among others; but here the difference stops. Who could remain always pure, when carried away by his disposition, excited by his temper, drawn by caprice, he can with impunity oppress, insult, humiliate his fellows. And, let it be carefully remarked, that intelligence, civilization, do not avail. The enlightened man, the civilized man, is none the less a man; that he should not oppress, it is necessary that it should be impossible for him to oppress. All men cannot, like Louis XIV, throw their stick from the window, when they feel a desire to strike."—*La Russie et Les Russes*, vol. II, pages 157-8.

Another authority, unimpeachable at all points, whose fortune it has been, from extensive travels, to see Slavery in the most various forms, and Slave-masters under the most various conditions—I refer to the great African traveller, Dr. Livingstone—thus touches the character of Slave-masters :

" I can never cease to be unfeignedly thankful that I was not born in a land of slaves. No one can understand the unutterable meanness of the slave system on the minds of those who, but for the strange obliquity which prevents them from *feeling the degradation of not being gentlemen enough to pay for services rendered*, would be equal in virtue to ourselves. Fraud becomes as natural to them 'as paying one's way' is to the rest of mankind."—*Livingstone's Travels*, chap. II, page 33.

Thus does the experience of Slavery in other countries confirm the sad experience among us.

SECOND ASSUMPTION.—Discarding now all the presumptuous boasts for Slavery, and bearing in mind its essential Barbarism, I come to consider that second assumption of Senators on the other side, which is, of course, inspired by the first, even if not its immediate consequence, that, under the Constitution, Slave-masters may take their slaves into the national Territories, and there continue to hold them, as at home in the Slave States; and that this would be the case in any territory newly acquired, by purchase or by war, as of Mexico on the South or Canada on the North.

And here I begin by the remark, that as the assumption of constitutional law is inspired by the assumption of fact with regard to the "en-

"nobling" character of Slavery, so it must lose much if not all of its force when the latter assumption is shown to be false, as has been done to-day.

When Slavery is seen to be the Barbarism which it is, there are few who would not cover it from sight, rather than insist upon sending it abroad with the flag of the Republic. It is only because people have been insensible to its true character that they have tolerated for a moment its exorbitant pretensions. Therefore this long exposition, where Slavery has been made to stand forth in its five-fold Barbarism, with the single object of compelling men to work without wages, naturally prepares the way to consider the assumption of constitutional law.

This assumption may be described as an attempt to *Africanize* the Constitution, by introducing into it the barbarous Law of Slavery, derived as we have seen originally from barbarous Africa; and then, through such *Africanization* of the Constitution, to *Africanize* the Territories, and to *Africanize* the National Government. In using this language to express the obvious effect of this assumption, I borrow a suggestive term, first employed by a Portuguese writer at the beginning of this century, when protesting against the spread of Slavery in Brazil. (See *Koster's Travels in Brazil*, vol. ii, p. 248.) Analyze the assumption, and it will be found to stand on two pretensions, either of which failing, the assumption fails also. These two are—first, the African pretension of property in man; and, secondly, the pretension that such property is recognised in the Constitution.

With regard to the first of these pretensions, I might simply refer to what I have already said at an earlier stage of this argument. But I should do injustice to the part it has been made to play in this controversy, if I did not again expose it. Then I sought particularly to show its Barbarism; now I shall show something more.

Property implies an owner and a thing owned. On the one side is a human being, and on the other side a thing. But the very idea of a human being necessarily excludes the idea of property in that being, just as the very idea of a thing necessarily excludes the idea of a human being. It is clear that a thing cannot be a human being, and it is equally clear that a human being cannot be a thing. And the law itself, when it adopts the phrase, "relation of master and slave," confesses its reluctance to sanction the claim of property. It shrinks from the pretension of Senators, and satisfies itself with a formula, which does not openly degrade human nature.

If this property does exist, out of what title is it derived?" Under what ordinance of Nature or of Nature's God is one human being stamped an owner and another stamped a thing? God is no respecter of persons. Where

is the sanction for this respect of certain persons to a degree which becomes outrage to other persons? God is the Father of the Human Family, and we are all his children. Where then is the sanction of this pretension by which a brother lays violent hands upon a brother? To ask these questions is humiliating; but it is clear there can be but one response. There is no sanction for such pretension; no ordinance for it, or title. On all grounds of reason, and waiving all questions of "positive" statute, the Vermont Judge was nobly right, when, rejecting the claim of a Slave-master, he said: "No; not until you show a Bill of Sale from the Almighty." Nothing short of this impossible link in the chain of title would do. I know something of the great judgments by which the jurisprudence of our country has been illustrated; but I doubt if there is anything in the wisdom of Marshall, the learning of Story, or the completeness of Kent, which will brighten with time like this honest decree.

The intrinsic feebleness of this pretension is apparent in the intrinsic feebleness of the arguments by which it is maintained. These are two-fold, and both have been put forth in recent debate by the Senator from Mississippi, [Mr. DAVIS.]

The first is the alleged inferiority of the African race; an argument which, while surrendering to Slavery a whole race, leaves it uncertain whether the same principle may not be applied to other races, as to the polished Japanese, who are now the guests of the nation, and even to persons of obvious inferiority in the white race. Indeed, the latter pretension is openly made in other quarters. The *Richmond Enquirer*, a leading journal of Slave-masters, declares, "The principle of Slavery is in itself right, and does not depend on difference of complexion." And a leading writer among Slave-masters, George Fitzhugh, of Virginia, in his *Sociology for the South*, declares, "Slavery, black or white, is right and necessary. Nature has made the weak in mind or body for slaves." And in the same vein, a Democratic paper of South Carolina has said, "Slavery is the natural and normal condition of the laboring man, white or black."

These more extravagant pretensions reveal still further the feebleness of the pretension put forth by the Senator; while instances, accumulating constantly, attest the difficulty of discriminating between the two races. Mr. Paxton, of Virginia, tells us, that "the best blood in Virginia flows in the veins of the slaves;" and fugitive slaves have been latterly advertised as possessing "a round face," "blue eyes," "flaxen hair," and as "escaping under the pretence of being a white man."

This is not the time to enter upon the great question of race, in the various lights of religion, history, and science. Sure I am that they who understand it best, will be least dis-

posed to the pretension, which on the assumed ground of inferiority would condemn one race to be the property of another. If the African race be inferior, as is alleged, then is it the unquestionable duty of a Christian Civilization to lift it from its degradation, not by the bludgeon and the chain, not by this barbarous pretension of ownership; but by a generous charity, which shall be measured precisely by the extent of its inferiority.

The second argument put forward for this pretension, and twice repeated by the Senator from Mississippi, is, that the Africans are the posterity of Ham, the son of Noah, through Canaan, who was cursed by Noah, to be the "servant"—that is the word employed—of his brethren, and that this malediction has fallen upon all his descendants, who are accordingly devoted by God to perpetual bondage, not only in the third and fourth generations, but throughout all succeeding time. Surely, when the Senator quoted Scripture to enforce the claim of Slave-masters, he did not intend a jest. And yet it is hard to suppose him in earnest. The Senator is Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which he is doubtless experienced. He may, perhaps, set a squadron in the field, but he has evidently considered very little the text of Scripture on which he relies. The Senator assumes, that it has fixed the doom of the colored race, leaving untouched the white race. Perhaps he does not know that, in the worst days of the Polish aristocracy, this same argument was adopted as the excuse for holding white serfs in bondage, precisely as it is now put forward by the Senator, and that even to this day the angry Polish noble addresses his white peasant as the "son of Ham."

It hardly comports with the gravity of this debate to dwell on such an argument, and yet I cannot go wrong if, for the sake of a much-injured race, I brush it away. To justify the Senator in his application of this ancient curse, he must maintain at least five different propositions, as essential links in the chain of the Afric-American slave: *first*, that, by this malediction, Canaan himself was actually changed into a "chattel," whereas he is simply made the "servant" of his brethren; *secondly*, that not merely Canaan, but all his posterity, to the remotest generation, was so changed, whereas the language has no such extent; *thirdly*, that the Afric-American actually belongs to the posterity of Canaan—an ethnological assumption absurdly difficult to establish; *fourthly*, that each of the descendants of Shem and Japheth has a right to hold an Afric-American fellow-man as a "chattel"—a proposition which finds no semblance of support; and *fifthly*, that every Slave-master is truly descended from Shem or Japheth—a pedigree which no anxiety can establish! This plain analysis, which may fitly excite a smile, shows

the five-fold absurdity of an attempt to found this pretension on

"Any successive title, long and dark,  
Drawn from the mouldy rolls of Noah's ark."

From the character of these two arguments for property in man, I am brought again to its denial.

It is natural that Senators who pretend that, by the law of nature, man may hold property in man, should find this pretension in the Constitution. But the pretension is as much without foundation in the Constitution as it is without foundation in nature. It is not too much to say that there is not one sentence, phrase, or word—not a single suggestion, hint, or equivocation, even—out of which any such pretension can be implied; while great national acts and important contemporaneous declarations in the Convention which framed the Constitution, in different forms of language, and also controlling rules of interpretation, render this pretension impossible. Partisans, taking counsel of their desires, find in the Constitution, as in the Scriptures, what they incline to find; and never was this more apparent than when Slave-masters deceive themselves so far as to find in the Constitution a pretension which exists only in their own souls.

Looking juridically for one moment at this question, we shall be brought to the conclusion, according to the admission of courts and jurists, first in Europe, and then in our own country, that Slavery can be derived from no doubtful word or mere pretension, but only from clear and special recognition. "The state of Slavery," said Lord Mansfield, pronouncing judgment in the great case of Somersett, "is of such a nature that it is incapable of being introduced on any reasons, moral or political, but only by *positive law*." It is so odious, that nothing can be suffered to support it but *POSITIVE LAW*—that is, express words of a written text; and this principle, which commends itself to the enlightened reason, has been adopted by several courts in the Slave States. Of course, every leaning must be against Slavery. A pretension so peculiar and offensive—so hostile to reason—so repugnant to the laws of nature and the inborn Rights of Man; which, in all its five-fold wrong, has no other object than to compel fellow-men to work without wages; such a pretension, so tyrannical, so unjust, so mean, so barbarous, can find no place in any system of Government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction*. It can spring from no doubtful phrases. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense.

At the adoption of the Constitution, this rule, promulgated in the Court of King's Bench, by the voice of the most finished magistrate in English history, was as well known in our country as any principle of the common law; especially was it known to the eminent lawyers

in the Convention; nor is it too much to say that the Constitution was framed with this rule on Slavery as a guide. And the Supreme Court of the United States at a later day, in the case of *United States v. Fisher*, 2 Cranch, 390, by the voice of Chief Justice Marshall, promulgated this same rule, in words stronger even than those of Lord Mansfield, saying: "Where rights are infringed, where fundamental principles are overthrown, where the general system of the laws is departed from, the legislative intention must be expressed with *irresistible clearness*, to induce a court of justice to suppose a design to effect such object" It is well known, however, that these two declarations are little more than new forms for the ancient rule of the common law, as expressed by Fortescue: *Impius et crudelis judicandus est qui Libertati non faret*; He is to be adjudged impious and cruel who does not favor Liberty; and, as expressed by Blackstone, "The law is always ready to catch at anything in favor of Liberty."

But, as no prescription runs against the King, so no prescription is allowed to run against Slavery, while all the early victories of Freedom are set aside by the Slave-masters of to-day. The prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri Territory, and all the precedents, legislative and judicial, for the exercise of this power, admitted from the beginning until now, have been overturned; but at last, bolder grown Slave-masters do not hesitate to assail that principle of jurisprudence which makes Slavery the creature of "positive law" alone, to be upheld only by words of "irresistible clearness." The case of *Somersett*, in which this great rule was declared, has been impeached on this floor, as the Declaration of Independence has been impeached also. And here the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BENJAMIN] has taken the lead. He has dwelt on the assertion that, in the history of English law, there were earlier cases, where a contrary principle was declared. But permit me to say that no such cases, even if they exist in authentic reports, can impair the influence of this well-considered authority. The Senator knows well that an old and barbarous case is a poor answer to a principle, which is brought into activity by the demands of an advancing Civilization, and which once recognised can never be denied; that jurisprudence is not a dark lantern, shining in a narrow circle, and never changing, but a gladsome light, which, slowly emerging from original darkness, grows and spreads with human improvement, until at last it becomes as broad and general as the Light of Day. When the Senator, in this age-leaguing all his forces — undertakes to drag down that immortal principle, which made Slavery impossible in England, as, thank God! it makes Slavery impossible under the Constitution, he vainly tugs to drag down a luminary from the sky.

The enormity of the pretension that Slavery is sanctioned by the Constitution becomes still more apparent, when we read the Constitution in the light of great national acts and of contemporaneous declarations. First comes the Declaration of Independence, the illuminated initial letter of our history, which in familiar words announces that "all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are Life, *Liberty*, and the Pursuit of Happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Nor does this Declaration, binding the consciences of all who enjoy the privileges it secured, stand alone. There is another national act, less known, but in itself a key to the first, when, at the successful close of the Revolution, the Continental Congress, in a solemn address to the people, loftily announced: "Let it be remembered, that it has ever been the pride and the boast of America, *that the rights for which she has contended were the rights of human nature*. By the blessing of the Author of these rights, they have prevailed over all opposition, and form THE BASIS of thirteen independent States." Now, whatever may be the privileges of States in their individual capacities, within their several local jurisdictions, no power can be attributed to the nation, in the absence of positive unequivocal grant, inconsistent with these two national declarations. Here is the national heart, the national soul, the national will, the national voice, which must inspire our interpretation of the Constitution, and enter into and diffuse itself through all the national legislation. Such are the commanding authorities which constitute "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness," and in more general words, "the Rights of Human Nature," without distinction of race, or recognition of the curse of Ham, as the basis of our national institutions. They need no additional support.

But, in strict harmony with these are the many utterances in the Convention which framed the Constitution: of Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania, who announced that "*he would never concur in upholding domestic Slavery*; it was a nefarious institution;" of Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, who said "that we had nothing to do with the conduct of the States as to Slavery, but we ought to be careful not to give any sanction to it;" of Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut, and Mr. Gorham, of Massachusetts, who all concurred with Mr. Gerry; and especially of Mr. Madison, of Virginia, who, in mild juridical phrase, "*THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT IN THE CONSTITUTION THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MAN*." And lastly, as if to complete the elaborate work of Freedom, and to give expression to all these utterances, the word "*servitude*," which had been allowed in

the clause on the apportionment of Representatives, was struck out, and the word "service" substituted instead. This final exclusion from the Constitution of the idea of property in man was on the motion of Mr. Randolph, of Virginia; and the reason assigned for the substitution, according to Mr. Madison, in his authentic report of the debate, was, that "the former was thought to express the condition of slaves, and the latter the obligations of free persons." Thus, at every point, by great national declarations, by frank utterances in the Convention, and by a positive act in adjusting the text of the Constitution, was the idea of property in man unequivocally rejected.

This pretension, which may be dismissed as utterly baseless, becomes absurd when it is considered to what result it necessarily conducts. If the Barbarism of Slavery, in all its five-fold wrong, is really embodied in the Constitution, so as to be beyond the reach of prohibition, either Congressional or local, in the Territories, then, for the same reason, it must be beyond the reach of prohibition or abolition, even by local authority in the States themselves, and, just so long as the Constitution continues unchanged, Territories and States alike must be open to all its blasting influences. And yet this pretension, which, in its natural consequences, overturns State Rights, is put forward by Senators, who profess to be the special guardians of State Rights.

Nor does this pretension derive any support from the much-debated clause in the Constitution for the rendition of fugitives from "service or labor," on which so much stress is constantly put. But I do not occupy your time now on this head, for two reasons—first, because, having already on a former occasion exhibited with great fullness the character of that clause, I am unwilling now thus incidentally to open the question upon it; and secondly, because, whatever may be its character—admitting that it confers power upon Congress—and admitting also, what is often denied, that, in defiance of commanding rules of interpretation, the equivocal words there employed have that "irresistible clearness" which is necessary in taking away Human Rights—yet nothing can be clearer than that the fugitives, whosoever they may be, are regarded under the Constitution as *persons*, and not as *property*.

I disdain to dwell on that other argument, brought forward by Senators, who, denying the Equality of Man, speciously assert the Equality of the States; and from this principle, true in many respects, jump to the conclusion, that Slave-masters are entitled, in the name of Equality, to take their slaves into the National Territories, under the solemn safeguards of the Constitution. But this argument comes back to the first pretension, that slaves are recognised as "property" in the Constitution. To that pretension, already amply exposed, we are always brought, nor can any sounding allega-

tions of State Equality avoid it. And yet, this very argument betrays the inconsistency of its authors. If persons held to service in the Slave States are "property" under the Constitution, then, under the provision—known as the "three-fifths" rule—which founds representation in the other House on such persons, there is a *property representation* from the Slave States, with voice and vote, while there is no such *property representation* from the Free States. With glaring inequality, the representation of Slave States is founded first on "persons," and secondly on a large part of their pretended property; while the representation of the Free States is founded simply on "persons," leaving all their boundless millions of property unrepresented. Thus, whichever way we approach it, the absurdity of this pretension becomes manifest. Assuming the pretension of property in man under the Constitution, you slap in the face the whole theory of State Equality, for you disclose a gigantic inequality between the Slave States and the Free States; and assuming the Equality of States, in the House of Representatives as elsewhere, you slap in the face the whole pretension of property in man under the Constitution.

I disdain to dwell also on that other argument, which, in the name of Popular Sovereignty, undertakes to secure to the people in the Territories the wicked power—sometimes called, by confusion of terms, right—to enslave their fellow-men; as if this pretension was not blasted at once by the Declaration of Independence, when it announced that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," and as if anywhere within the jurisdiction of the Constitution, which contains no sentence, phrase, or word, sanctioning this outrage, and which carefully excludes the idea of property in man, while it surrounds all persons with the highest safeguards of a citizen, such pretension could exist. Whatever it may be elsewhere, Popular Sovereignty within the sphere of the Constitution has its limitations. Claiming for all the largest liberty of a true Civilization, it compresses all within the constraints of Justice; nor does it allow any man to assert a right to do what he pleases, except when he pleases to do right. As well within the Territories attempt to make a King as attempt to make a slave. But this pretension—rejected alike by every Slave-master and by every lover of Freedom—

Where I behold a factious band agree  
To call it freedom when themselves are free,

proceeding originally from a vain effort to avoid the impending question between Freedom and Slavery—assuming a delusive phrase of Freedom as a cloak for Slavery—speaking with the voice of Jacob while its hands are the hands of Esau—and, by its plausible nick-name, enabling politicians sometimes to deceive the public and sometimes even to deceive them-

selves—may be dismissed with the other kindred pretensions for Slavery, while the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLAS], who, if not its inventor, has been its boldest defender, will learn that Slave-masters for whom he has done so much cannot afford to be generous; that their gratitude is founded on what they expect, and not on what they have received; and, that having its root in desire rather than in fruition, it necessarily withers and dies with the power to serve them. The Senator, revolving these things in his mind, may confess the difficulty of his position, and, perhaps,

—remember Milo's end,  
Wedged in that Timber which he strove to rend.

And here I close this branch of the argument, which I have treated less fully than the first, partly because time and strength fail me, but chiefly because the Barbarism of Slavery, when fully established, supersedes all other inquiry. But enough has been done on this head. At the risk of repetition, I now gather it together. The assumption that Slave-masters, under the Constitution, may take their slaves into the Territories, and continue to hold them as in the States, stands on two pretensions—first that man may hold property in man, and secondly that this property is recognised in the Constitution. But we have seen that the pretended property in man stands on no reason, while the two special arguments by which it has been asserted, first an alleged inferiority of race, and secondly the ancient curse of Ham, are grossly insufficient to uphold such a pretension. And we have next seen that this pretension has as little support in the Constitution as in reason; that Slavery is of such an offensive character, that it can find support only in "positive" sanction, and words of "irresistible clearness"; that this benign rule, questioned in the Senate, is consistent with the principles of an advanced civilization; that no such "positive" sanction, in words of "irresistible clearness," can be found in the Constitution, while, in harmony with the Declaration of Independence, and the Address of the Continental Congress, the contemporaneous declarations in the Convention, and especially the act of the Convention in substituting "service" for "servitude," on the ground that the latter expressed "the condition of slaves," all attest that the pretension that man can hold property in man was carefully, scrupulously, and completely excluded from the Constitution, so that it has no semblance of support in that sacred text; nor is this pretension, which is unsupported in the Constitution, helped by the two arguments, one in the name of State Equality, and the other in the name of Popular Sovereignty, both of which are properly put aside.

Sir, the true principle, which, reversing the assumptions of Slave-masters, makes Freedom *national* and Slavery *sectional*, while every just claim of the Slave States is harmonized with the irresistible predominance of Freedom

under the Constitution, has been declared at Chicago. Not questioning the right of each State, whether South Carolina or Turkey, Virginia or Russia, to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, the Convention there assembled has explicitly announced Freedom to be "the normal condition of all the Territory of the United States," and has explicitly denied "the authority of Congress, of a Territorial Legislature, or of any individuals, to give legal existence to Slavery in any Territory of the United States." Such is the triumphant response, by the aroused millions of the North, alike to the assumption of Slave-masters that the Constitution, of its own force, carries Slavery into the Territories, and also to the device of politicians, that the people of the Territories, in the exercise of a dishonest Popular Sovereignty, may plant Slavery there. This response is complete at all points, whether the Constitution acts upon the Territories before their organization, or only afterward; for, in the absence of a Territorial Government, there can be no "positive" law in words of "irresistible clearness" for Slavery, as there can be no such law, when a Territorial Government is organized, under the Constitution. Thus the normal condition of the Territories is confirmed by the Constitution, which, when extended over them, renders Slavery impossible, while it writes upon the soil and engraves upon the rock everywhere the law of impartial Freedom, without distinction of color or race.

Mr. President, this argument is now closed. Pardon me for the time I have occupied. It is long since I have made any such claim upon your attention. Pardon me, also, if I have said anything which I ought not to have said. I have spoken frankly, and from the heart; if severely, yet only with the severity of a sorrowful candor, calling things by their right names, and letting historic facts tell their unimpeachable story. I have spoken in the patriotic hope of contributing to the welfare of my country, and also in the assured conviction that what I have said will find a response in generous souls. I believe that I have said nothing which is not sustained by well-founded argument or well-founded testimony, nothing which can be controverted without a direct assault upon reason or upon truth.

The two assumptions of Slave-masters have been answered. But this is not enough. Let the answer become a legislative act, by the admission of Kansas as a Free State. Then will the Barbarism of Slavery be repelled, and the pretension of property in man be rebuked. Such an act, closing this long struggle by the assurance of peace to the Territory, if not of tranquillity to the whole country, will be more grateful still as the herald of that better day, near at hand, when Freedom shall be installed

everywhere under the National Government; when the National Flag, wherever it floats, on sea or land, within the national jurisdiction, will not cover a single slave; and when the Declaration of Independence, now reviled in the name of Slavery, will once again be revered as the American Magna Charta of Human Rights. Nor is this all. Such an act will be the first stage in those triumphs by which the Republic—lifted in character so as to become an example to mankind—will enter at last upon its noble “prerogative of teaching the nations how to live.”

Thus, sir, speaking for Freedom in Kansas, I have spoken for Freedom everywhere,

and for Civilization; and, as the less is contained in the greater, so are all arts, all sciences, all economies, all refinements, all charities, all delights of life, embodied in this cause. You may reject it; but it will be only for to-day. The sacred animosity between Freedom and Slavery can end only with the triumph of Freedom. This same Question will be soon carried before that high tribunal, supreme over Senate and Court, where the judges will be counted by millions, and where the judgment rendered will be the solemn charge of an aroused people, instructing a new President, in the name of Freedom, to see that Civilization receives no detriment.

## APPENDIX.

When Mr. SUMNER resumed his seat, Mr. CHESNUT, of South Carolina, spoke as follows :

Mr. President, after the extraordinary though characteristic speech just uttered in the Senate, it is proper that I assign the reason for the position we are now inclined to assume. After ranging over Europe, crawling through the back doors to whine at the feet of British aristocracy, craving pity, and reaping a rich harvest of contempt, the slanderer of States and men reappears in the Senate. We had hoped to be relieved from the outpourings of such vulgar malice. We had hoped that one who had felt, though ignorantly he failed to meet, the consequences of a former insolence, would have become wiser, if not better, by experience. In this I am disappointed, and I regret it. Mr. President, in the heroic ages of the world, men were deified for the possession and the exercise of some virtues—wisdom, truth, justice, magnanimity, courage. In Egypt, also, we know they deified beasts and reptiles; but even that bestial people worshipped their idols on account of some supposed virtue. It has been left for this day, for this country, for the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, to *deify the incarnation of malice, mendacity, and cowardice*. Sir, we do not intend to be guilty of aiding in the apotheosis of pusillanimity and meanness. We do not intend to contribute, by any conduct on our part, to increase the devotees at the shrine of this new idol. We know what is expected and what is desired. *We are not inclined again to send forth the recipient of PUNISHMENT howling through the world, yelping fresh cries of slander and malice. These are the reasons*, which I feel it due to myself and others to give to the Senate and the country, why we have quietly listened to what has been said, and why we can take no other notice of the matter.

In these words, Mr. CHESNUT refers to the assault upon Mr. SUMNER with a bludgeon on the floor of the Senate, by a Representative from South Carolina, since dead, aided by another Representative from that same State, and also a Representative from Virginia, on account of which Mr. SUMNER had been compelled to leave his seat vacant, and seek

the restoration of his health by travel. As Mr. CHESNUT spoke, he was surrounded by the Slave-masters of the Senate, who seemed to approve what he said. There was no call to order by the Chair, which was occupied at the time by Mr. BIGLER, of Pennsylvania. Mr. SUMNER obtained the floor with difficulty, while a motion was pending for the postponement of the question, and said :

Mr. President, before this question passes away, I think I ought to make (though perhaps there is no occasion for it) a response to the Senator from South Carolina. [“No!” from several Senators.] Only one word. I exposed to-day the *Barbarism of Slavery*. What the Senator has said in reply to me, I may well print in an Appendix to my speech as an additional illustration. That is all.

Mr. HAMMOND, of South Carolina, said :  
I hope he will do it.

The following letter, from a venerable citizen, an ornament of our legislative halls at the beginning of the century, and now the oldest survivor of all who have ever been members of Congress, is too valuable, in its testimony and its counsel, to be omitted in this place :

BOSTON, June 5, 1860.

DEAR SIR : I have read a few abstracts from your noble speech, but must wait for it in a pamphlet form, that I may read it in such type as eyes, in the eighty-ninth year of their age, will permit. But I have read enough to approve, and rejoice that you have been permitted, thus truly, fully, and faithfully, to expose the “Barbarism” of Slavery on that very floor, on which you were so cruelly and brutally stricken down by the spirit of that Barbarism.

I only hope that in an Appendix you will preserve the *terra effigies* of that insect that attempted to sting you. Remember that the value of amber is increased by the insect it preserves.

Yours, very truly,  
JOSIAH QUINCY.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.

1860.

Republished by the Congressional Republican Committee. Price \$2 per hundred.

# Immediate Emancipation a War Measure!

## S P E E C H .

OF

HON. CHARLES SUMNER,  
OF MASSACHUSETTS,

ON

THE BILL PROVIDING FOR EMANCIPATION IN  
MISSOURI.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, FEBRUARY 12TH, 1863.

Mr. SUMNER. Mr. President, if I speak tardily in this debate I hope for the indulgence of the Senate. Had I been able to speak earlier I should have spoken; but, though present in the Chamber, and voting when this subject was under consideration formerly, I was at the time too much of an invalid to take an active part in the proceedings. In justice to myself and to the great question under consideration I cannot be silent.

I have already voted to give \$20,000,000 to Missouri, in order to secure freedom at once to her slaves and to make her at once a free State. I am ready to vote more, if more be needed for this purpose; but I will not vote money to be sunk and lost in an uncertain scheme of prospective emancipation, where freedom is a jack-o'-lantern, and the only certainty is to be found in the congressional appropriation. For money paid down, freedom, too, must be paid down.

Notwithstanding all differences of opinion on this important question, there is much occasion for congratulation in the progress that has been made.

There is one point on which the Senate is substantially united. A large majority will vote for emancipation. This is much, both as a sign of the present and a prophecy for the future. A large majority, in the name of Congress, will offer pecuniary aid to this object. This is a further sign and prophecy. Such a vote, and such an appropriation, will constitute an epoch. Only a few short years ago the very mention of slavery in Congress was forbidden, and all discussion of it was stifled. Now, emancipation is an accepted watchword, while slavery is openly denounced as a guilty thing worthy of death.

It is admitted that now, under the exigency of war, the United States ought to co-operate with any State in the abolition of slavery, giving to it pecuniary aid; and

it is proposed to apply this principle practically in Missouri. It was fit that emancipation, destined to end the rebellion, should first begin in South Carolina, where the rebellion first began. It is also fit that the action of Congress in behalf of emancipation should first begin in Missouri, which, through the faint-hearted remissness of Congress, as late as 1820, was opened to slavery. Had Congress at that time firmly insisted that Missouri, on entering the Union, should be a free State, the vast appropriation now proposed would have been saved; and, better still, this vaster civil war would have been prevented. The whole country is now paying with treasure and blood for that fatal surrender. Alas! that men should forget that God is bound by no compromise, and that, sooner or later, He will insist that justice shall be done. There is not a dollar spent, and not a life sacrificed, in this calamitous war, which does not plead against any repetition of that wicked folly. Blasted be the tongue which speaks of compromise with slavery!

But, though happily compromise is no longer openly proposed, yet it insinuates itself in this debate. In former times it took the form of bare-faced concession to slavery, as in the admission of Missouri as a slave State; the annexation of Texas as a slave State; the waiver of the prohibition of slavery in the Territories; the atrocious bill for the re-enslavement of fugitives; and the opening of Kansas to slavery, first by the Kansas bill, and then by the Lecompton constitution. In each of these cases there was a concession to slavery which history now records with shame, but it was by this that your wicked slaveholding conspiracy waxed confident and strong, till at last it was ripe for war.

And now it is proposed, as an agency in the suppression of the rebellion, to put an end to slavery, By proclamation of the

President all the slaves in certain States, and designated parts of States, are declared to be free. Of course this proclamation is a war measure, rendered just and necessary by the exigencies of war. As such it is summary and instant in its operation; not prospective or procrastinating. A proclamation of prospective emancipation would have been an absurdity; like a proclamation of prospective battle, where not a blow was to be struck, or a cannon pointed, before 1876, unless, meanwhile, the enemy desired it. What is done in war must be done promptly, except, perhaps, under the policy of defense. Gradualism is delay; and delay is the betrayal of victory. If you would be triumphant, strike quickly. Let your blows be felt at once, without notice or premonition; and especially without time for resistance or debate. Time always deserts those who do not appreciate its value. Strike promptly, and time becomes your invaluable ally. Strike slowly, gradually, prospectively, and time goes over to the enemy.

But every argument for the instant operation of the proclamation; every consideration in favor of dispatch in war, is especially applicable to all that is done by Congress as a war measure. In a period of peace, Congress might fitly consider whether emancipation should be immediate or prospective, and we might listen with patience to the instances adduced by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Doolittle] in favor of delay; to the case of Pennsylvania and to the case of New York, where slaves were tardily admitted to their birthright. Such arguments, though to my judgment of little value at any time, would then be legitimate. But now, when we are considering how to put down the rebellion, they are not even legitimate. There is but one way to put down the rebellion, and that is *instant action*; and all that is done, whether in the field, in the Cabinet, or in Congress, must partake of this character. Whatever is postponed for twenty years, or ten years, may seem to be abstractly politic or wise; but it is in no sense a war measure, nor can it contribute essentially to the suppression of the rebellion.

Now, I think that I may assume, without contradiction, that the proposed tender of money to Missouri for the sake of emancipation is a war measure, to be vindicated as such under the Constitution of the United States. It is also an act of justice to an oppressed race; but it is not in this unquestionable character that it is now commended to Congress. If it were urged on no other ground, even if every consideration of philanthropy and of religion pleaded for it with rarest eloquence, I fear

that it would stand but little chance in either House of Congress. Let us not disguise the truth. Except as a war measure, in order to aid in putting down the rebellion, this proposition would find little hospitality here. Senators are ready to vote money—as the British Parliament voted subsidies—in order to supply the place of soldiers, or to remove a stronghold of the rebellion; all of which is done by emancipation. I do not overstate the case. Slavery is a stronghold of the rebellion, which, through emancipation, will be removed, while every slave and every slave-master will become an ally of the Government. Therefore emancipation is a war measure, as constitutional as the raising of armies or the occupation of a hostile territory.

But in vindicating emancipation as a war measure, we must see that it is made under such conditions as to exercise a present, *instant* influence against the rebellion. It must be immediate, not prospective. In proposing prospective emancipation you propose a measure which can have little or no influence on the war.—Senators abstractly may prefer that emancipation should be prospective rather than immediate; but this is not the time for the exercise of any such abstract preference. Whatever is done as a war measure must be immediate, or it will cease to have this character. If made prospective, it will not be a war measure, whatever you may call it.

If I am correct in this statement—and I do not see how it can be questioned—then is the appropriation for immediate emancipation just and proper under the Constitution, while that for prospective emancipation is without any sanction, except what it may find in the sentiments of justice and humanity.

It is proposed to vote \$10,000,000 of money to promote emancipation ten years from now. Perhaps I am sanguine, but I cannot doubt that before the expiration of that period slavery will die in Missouri under the awakened judgment of the people, even without the action of Congress. If our resources were infinite, we might tender this large sum by way of experiment; but with a Treasury drained to the bottom, and with a debt accumulating in fabulous proportions, I do not understand how we can vote millions, which, in the first place, will be of little or no service in the suppression of the rebellion, and, in the second place, which will be simply a largess in no way essential to the subversion of slavery.

Whatever is given for immediate emancipation is given for the national defense, and for the safety and glory of the Repub-

lic. It will be a blow at the rebellion.—Whatever is given for prospective emancipation will be a gratuity to slaveholders and a tribute to slavery. Pardon me if I repeat what I have already said in this debate, "millions for defense, but not a cent for tribute;" millions for defense against peril from whatever quarter it may come; but not a cent for tribute in any quarter, especially not a cent for tribute to the loathsome tyranny of slavery.

I know it is sometimes said that even prospective emancipation will help to weaken the rebellion. That it will impair the confidence in slavery and also its value, I cannot doubt; but it is equally clear that it will leave slavery still alive and on its legs, and just so long as this is the case there must be controversy and debate with attending weakness; while reaction will perpetually lift its crest. Instead of tranquility, which we all seek for Missouri, we shall have contention. Instead of peace we shall have prolonged war. Every year's delay, ay, sir, every week's delay in dealing death to slavery leaves just so much of opportunity to the rebellion; for so long as slavery is allowed to exist in Missouri the rebellion will still struggle, not without hope for its ancient mastery. But let slavery cease at once and all this will be changed. There will be no room for controversy or debate with its attending weakness, nor can reaction lift its crest.—There will be no opportunity to the rebellion, which must cease all efforts there, when Missouri can no longer be a slave State. Freedom will become our watchful, generous, and invincible ally, while the well-being, the happiness, the repose, and the renown of Missouri will be established forever.

Thus far, sir, I have presented the argument on grounds peculiar to this case; and here I might stop. Having shown that, as a military necessity, and for the sake of that economy which it is our duty to cultivate, emancipation must be immediate, I need not go further; but I do not content myself here. The whole question is open between immediate emancipation and prospective emancipation; or, in other words, between doing right at once and doing it at some distant future day. Procrastination is the thief not only of time, but of virtue itself. But such is the nature of man that he is disposed always to delay, so that he does nothing to-day which he can put off till to-morrow. Perhaps in no single matter has this disposition been more apparent than with regard to slavery. Every consideration of humanity, justice, religion, reason, common sense, and history, all demanded the instant cessation of an intolerable wrong, without procrastination or delay. But hu-

man nature would not yield; and we have been driven to argue the question whether an outrage, asserting property in man, denying the conjugal relation, annulling the parental relation, shutting out human improvement, and robbing its victim of all the fruits of his industry—the whole, in order to compel work without wages—should be stopped instantly or gradually. It is only when we regard slavery in its essential elements, and look at its unutterable and unquestionable atrocity, that we can fully comprehend the mingled folly and wickedness of this question. If it were merely a question of economy, or a question of policy, then the Senate might properly debate whether the change should be instant or gradual; but considerations of economy and policy are all absorbed in the higher claims of justice and humanity. There is no question whether justice and humanity shall be immediate or gradual. Men are to cease at once from wrong doing; they are to obey the Ten Commandments instantly and not gradually.

Senators who argue for prospective emancipation, show themselves insensible to the true character of slavery, or insensible to the requirements of reason. One or the other of these alternatives must be accepted.

Shall property in man be disowned immediately or only prospectively? Reason answers immediately.

Shall the conjugal relation be maintained immediately or only prospectively? Reason recoils from the wicked absurdity of the inquiry.

Shall the parental relation be recognized immediately or only prospectively? Reason is indignant at the question.

Shall the opportunities of knowledge, including the right to read the Book of Life, be opened immediately or prospectively? Reason brands the idea of delay as impious.

Shall the fruits of his own industry be given to a man immediately or prospectively? Reason insists that every man shall have his own without postponement.

And history, thank God! speaking by examples, testifies in conformity with reason. The conclusion is irresistible. If you would contribute to the strength and glory of the United States; if you would bless Missouri; if you would benefit the slave-master; if you would elevate the slave; and still further, if you would afford an example which shall fortify and sanctify the Republic, making it at once citadel and temple, do not put off the day of freedom. In this case, more than in any other, he gives twice who quickly gives.



# UNIVERSAL EMANCIPATION WITHOUT COMPENSATION.

"May not Congress pronounce all slaves free? *The Constitution speaks to the point. They have the power in clear and unequivocal terms, and will clearly and certainly exercise it.*"—PATRICK HENRY.

## SPEECH OF

## HON. CHARLES SUMNER.

## ON THE

*Proposed Amendment of the Constitution Abolishing Slavery through the United States,*

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, APRIL 8, 1864.

Mr. SUMNER. Mr. President, if an angel from the skies or a stranger from another planet were permitted to visit this earth and to examine its surface, who can doubt that his eyes would rest with astonishment upon the outstretched extent and exhaustless resources of this Republic of the New World, young in years but already rooted beyond any dynasty in history? In proportion as he considered and understood all those things among us which enter into and constitute the national life, his astonishment would increase, for he would find a numerous people, powerful beyond precedent, without a king or a noble, but with the schoolmaster instead. And yet the astonishment which he confessed, as all these things appeared before him, would swell into marvel as he learned that in this Republic, which had arrested his admiration, where there was neither king nor noble, but the schoolmaster instead, there were four million human beings in abject bondage, degraded to be chattels, under the pretense of property in man, driven by the lash like beasts, despoiled of all rights, even the right to knowledge and the sacred right of family; so that the relation of husband and wife was impossible and no parent could claim his own child; while all were condemned to brutish ignorance. Startled by what he beheld, the stranger would naturally inquire by what authority, under what sanction, and through what terms of law or Constitution, this fearful inconsistency, so shocking to human nature itself, continued to be upheld. But his growing astonishment would know no bounds, when he was pointed to the Constitution of the United States, as the final guardian and conservator of this peculiar and many-headed wickedness.

"And is it true," the stranger would exclaim, "that, in laying the foundations of this Republic, dedicated to human rights, all these wrongs have been positively established?" He would ask to see that

Constitution and to know the fatal words by which the sacrifice was commanded. The trembling with which he began its perusal would be succeeded by joy as he finished it; for he would find nothing in that golden text, not a single sentence, phrase, or word even, to serve as origin, authority, or apology, for the outrage. And then his astonishment, already knowing no bounds, would break forth anew, as he exclaimed, "Shameful and irrational as is slavery, it is not more shameful or irrational than that unsupported interpretation which undertakes to make your Constitution the final guardian and conservator of this terrible and unpardonable denial of human rights."

Such a stranger as I have described, coming from afar, with eyes which no local bias had distorted, and with understanding which no local custom had disturbed, would naturally see the Constitution precisely as it is in its actual text, and he would interpret it in its true sense, without prepossession or prejudice. Of course he would know, what all jurisprudence teaches and what all reason confirms, that human rights cannot be taken away by any indirection or by any vain imagining of something that was intended but was not said, and, as a natural consequence, that slavery can exist—if exist it can at all—only by virtue of a *positive text*, and that what is true of slavery is true also of all its incidents; and the enlightened stranger would insist that, in all interpretation of the Constitution, that cardinal principal must never for a moment be out of mind, but must be kept ever forward as guide and master, that *slavery cannot stand on inference*, nor can any support of slavery stand on inference. Thus informed, and in the light of a pervasive principle,

"How far that little candle throws his beams!"

he would peruse the Constitution from beginning to end, from its opening preamble to its final amendment, and then the joyful opinion would be given.

There are three things which he would observe: first and foremost, that the dismal words "slave" and "slavery" do not appear in the Constitution; so that if the unnatural pretension of property in man lurk anywhere in that text, it is under a feigned name or an *alias*, which of itself is cause of suspicion, while an imperative rule renders its recognition impossible. Next, he would consider the preamble, which is the key to open the whole succeeding instrument; but here no single word can be found which does not open the Constitution to freedom and close it to slavery. The object of the Constitution is announced to be "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of *liberty* to ourselves and our posterity;" all of which, in every particular, is absolutely inconsistent with slavery. And thirdly, he would observe those time-honored, most efficacious, chain-breaking words in the Amendments: "*No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.*" Scorning all false interpretations and glosses which may have been fastened upon the Constitution as a support of slavery, and with these three things before him, he would naturally declare that there was nothing in the original text on which this hideous wrong could

NOT

be founded anywhere within the sphere of its operation. With astonishment he would ask again by what strange delusion or hallucination the reason had been so far overcome as to recognize slavery in the Constitution, when plainly it is not there, and cannot be there? The answer is humiliating, but it is easy.

People naturally find in texts of Scripture the support of their own religious opinions or prejudices; and, in the same way, they naturally find in texts of the Constitution the support of their own political opinions or prejudices. And this may not be in either case because Scripture or Constitution, when truly interpreted, support these opinions or prejudices; but because people are apt to find in texts simply a reflection of themselves. Most clearly and indubitably, whoever finds any support of slavery in the Constitution of the United States has first found such support in himself; not that he will hesitate, perhaps, to condemn slavery in words of approved gentleness, but because from unhappy education or more unhappy insensibility to this wrong, he has already conceded to it a certain traditional foothold of immunity, which he straightway transfers from himself to the Constitution. In dealing with this subject, it is not the Constitution, so much as human nature itself, which has been at fault. Let the people change, and the Constitution will change also; for the Constitution is but the shadow, while the people are the substance.

But under the influence of the present struggle for national life, and in obedience to its incessant exigencies, the people have already changed, and in nothing so much as slavery. Old opinions and prejudices have dissolved, and that traditional foothold which slavery once possessed has been gradually weakened until now it scarcely exists. Naturally this change must sooner or later show itself in the interpretation of the Constitution. But it is already visible even there, in the concession of powers over slavery which were formerly denied. The time, then, has come when the Constitution, which has been so long interpreted for slavery, may be interpreted for freedom. This is one stage of triumph. Universal emancipation, which is at hand, can be won only by complete emancipation of the Constitution itself, which has been degraded to wear chains so long that its real character is scarcely known.

Sometimes the concession is made on the ground of *military necessity*. The capacious war powers of the Constitution are invoked, and it is said that in their legitimate exercise slavery may be destroyed. There is much in this concession; more even than is imagined by many from whom it proceeds. It is war, say they, which puts these powers in motion; but they forget that wherever slavery exists there is perpetual war—that slavery itself is a *state of war* between two races, where one is for the moment victor—pictured accurately by Jefferson when he described it as “permitting one half of the citizens to trample on the rights of the other, transforming those into enemies, and these into despots.” Therefore, wherever slavery exists, even in seeming peace, the war powers may be invoked to put an end to a condition which is internecine, and to overthrow pretensions which are hostile to every attribute of the Almighty.

But it is not on military necessity alone that the concession is made. There are many who, as they read the Constitution now, see its powers over slavery more clearly than before. The old superstition is abandoned; and they join with Patrick Henry when, in the Virginia convention, he declared that the power of manumission was given to Congress. He did not hesitate to argue against the adoption of the Constitution because it gave this power. And shall we be less perspicacious for freedom than this Virginia statesman was for slavery? Discerning this power he confessed his dismay; but let us confess our joy.

We have already seen that slavery can find no support in the Constitution. Glance now at the positive provisions by which it is brought completely under the control of Congress.

1. First among the powers of Congress, and associated with the power to lay and collect taxes, is that "to provide for the common defence and general welfare." It has been questioned whether this is a substantive power, or simply incident to that with which it is associated. But it seems difficult, if not absurd, to insist that Congress has not this substantive power. Shall it not provide for the common defence? Shall it not provide for the general welfare? If it cannot do these things in a great crisis it had better abdicate. In the discussions on the Constitution in the Virginia convention, Mr. George Mason, one of its most decided opponents, said: "That Congress should have power to provide for the general welfare of the Union, *I grant.*" (2 Eliot's Debates, 327.) But the language of Patrick Henry, to which allusion has been already made, was still more explicit. He foresaw that this power would naturally be directed against slavery, and he said: (1829)

"Slavery is detested. We feel its fatal effects. We deplore it with all the pity of humanity. Let all these considerations, at some future period, press with full force on the minds of Congress. Let that urbanity which, I trust, will distinguish Americans, and the necessity of national defence—let all these things operate on their minds; they will search that paper [the Constitution] and see if they have the power of manumission. And have they not, sir? Have they not the power *to provide for the general defence and welfare?* May they not think that they call for the abolition of slavery? May they not pronounce all slaves free? And will they not be warranted by that power? This is no ambiguous implication or logical deduction. *The paper speaks to the point. They have the power in clear and unequivocal terms, and will clearly and certainly exercise it.*"—Eliot's Debates, vol. 3. p. 590.

Language could not be more positive. To all who ask for the power of Congress over slavery, here is a sufficient answer; and remember that this is not my speech, but the speech of Patrick Henry, who says that the Constitution "speaks to the point."

2. Next comes the clause, "Congress shall have power to declare war; to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy." A power like this is from its very nature unlimited. In raising and supporting an army, in providing and maintaining a navy, Congress is not restrained to any particular class or color. It may call upon all and authorize that *contract* which the Government makes with an enlisted soldier. But such a contract would be in itself an act of manumission; for a slave cannot make a contract. And if the contract be followed by actual service, who can deny its completest efficiency in enfranchising the soldier-slave and his whole family? Shakspeare, immortal teacher, gives expression to an instinctive sentiment when he

makes Henry V, on the eve of the battle of Agincourt, encourages his men by promising,

“ For he to day that sheds his blood with me,  
Shall be my brother; he he ne’er so vile,  
This day shall gentle his condition.”

3. There is still another clause: “The United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a *republican form of government.*” There again is a plain duty. But the question recurs, what is a republican form of government? John Adams, in the correspondence of his old age, says:

“ The customary meanings of the words *republic* and *commonwealth* have been infinite. They have been applied to every Government under heaven; that of Turkey and that of Spain, as well as that of Athens and of Rome, of Geneva and San Marino.”—*John Adams’s Works*, volume 10, page 378.

But the guarantee of a republican form of government must have a meaning congenial with the purposes of the Constitution. If a Government like that of Turkey, or even like that of Venice, could come within the scope of this guarantee, it would be of little value. It would be words and nothing more. Evidently it must be construed so as to uphold the Constitution according to all the promises of its preamble, and Mr. Madison has left a record, first published to the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, [Mr. COLLAMER,] the chairman of the Committee on the Library, showing that it was originally suggested in part by the fear of slavery, so that in construing it we must not forget slavery. The preamble and the record are important, disclosing the real intention of this guarantee. But no American need be at a loss to designate some of the distinctive elements of a republic according to the idea of American institutions. These will be found, first, in the Declaration of Independence, by which it is solemnly announced “that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights: that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” And they will be found, secondly, in that other guarantee and prohibition of the Constitution, in harmony with the Declaration of Independence; “*No person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.*” Such are some of the essential elements of a “republican form of government,” which cannot be disowned by us without disowning the very muniments of our liberties; and it is these which the United States are bound to guaranty. But all these make slavery impossible. It is idle to say that this result was not anticipated. It would be, then, only another illustration that our fathers “*builded wiser than they knew.*”

4. But, independent of the clause of guarantee, there is the clause just quoted, which in itself is a source of power: “*No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.*” This was a part of the amendments to the Constitution proposed by the First Congress, under the popular demand for a Bill of Rights. Though brief, it is in itself alone a whole Bill of Rights. Liberty can be lost only by “*due process of law,*” words borrowed from the old liberty-loving common law, illustrated by our master in law, Lord Coke, but best explained by the late Mr. Justice Bronson, of New York, in a judicial opinion where he says:

"The meaning of the section then seems to be, that no member of the State shall be disfranchised or deprived of any of his rights or privileges unless the matter shall be adjudged against him upon trial had according to the course of common law. The words 'due process of law' in this place cannot mean less than a prosecution or suit instituted and conducted according to the prescribed forms and solemnities for ascertaining guilt or determining the title to property."—4 *Hill's Reports*, 146.

Such is the protection which is thrown by the Constitution over every "person," without distinction of race or color, class or condition. There can be no doubt about the universality of this protection. All, without exception, come within its scope. Its natural meaning is plain; but there is an incident of history which makes it plainer still, excluding all possibility of misconception. A clause of this character was originally recommended as an amendment by two slave States, North Carolina and Virginia, but it was restrained by them to *freemen*, thus: "No *freeman* ought to be deprived of his life, *liberty*, or property but by the *law of the land*." But, when the recommendation came before Congress, the word "person" was substituted for "freeman," and the more searching phrase "due process of law" was substituted for "the law of the land." In making this change, rejecting the recommendation of two slave States, the authors of this amendment revealed their purpose, that *no person* wearing the human form should be deprived of *liberty* without due process of law; and the proposition was adopted by the votes of Congress and then of the States as a part of the Constitution. Clearly on its face it is an express guarantee of personal liberty and an express prohibition against its invasion anywhere.

In the face of this guarantee and prohibition—for it is both—how can any "person" be held as a slave? But it is sometimes said that this provision must be restrained to places within the exclusive jurisdiction of the national Government. Let me say frankly that such formerly was my own impression, often avowed in this Chamber; but I never doubted its complete efficacy to render slavery unconstitutional in all such places, so that "no person" could be held as a slave at the national capitol or in any national territory. Constitutionally slavery has always been an outlaw wherever that provision of the Constitution was applicable. Nobody doubted that it was binding on the national courts, and yet it was left unexecuted—a dead letter, killed by the predominant influence of slavery, until at last Congress was obliged by legislative act to do what the courts had failed to do, and to put an end to slavery in the national capital and national territories.

But there are no words in this guarantee and prohibition by which they are restrained to any exclusive jurisdiction. They are broad and general as the Constitution itself; and since they are in support of human rights they cannot be restrained by any interpretation. There is no limitation in them, and nobody can supply any such limitation, without encountering the venerable maxim of law, *Impius ac crudelis qui libertati non favet*—"Impious and cruel is he who does not favor liberty." Long enough courts and Congress have merited this condemnation. The time has come when they should merit it no longer. The Constitution should become a living letter under the predominant influence of freedom. It is this conviction which has brought petitioners to Congress, during the present session, asking that the Con-

stitution shall be simply executed against slavery and not altered. Ah! sir, it would be a glad sight to see that Constitution, which we have all sworn to support, interpreted generously, nobly, gloriously, for freedom, so that everywhere within its influence the chains should drop from the slave. If it be said that this was not anticipated at the adoption of the Constitution, I remind you of the words of Patrick Henry at the time when he said, "the paper speaks to the point." No doubt. It does speak to the point, especially since the adoption of the amendments. Cicero preferred to err with Plato rather than to think right with other men. And pardon me if on this occasion, when my country is in peril from slavery, and when human rights are to be rescued, I prefer to err with Patrick Henry, in assuming power for freedom, rather than to think right with Senators who hesitate in such a cause.

Mr. President, thus stands the case. There is nothing in the Constitution on which slavery can rest, or find any the least support. Even on the face of that instrument it is an *outlaw*; but if we look further into its provisions we find at least four distinct sources of power, which, if executed, must render slavery impossible, while the preamble makes them all vital for freedom: first, the power to provide for the common defence and general welfare; secondly, the power to raise armies and maintain navies; thirdly, the power to guaranty to every State a republican form of government; and fourthly, the power to secure *liberty* to every person restrained without due process of law. But all these provisions are something more than powers; *they are duties also*. And yet we are constantly and painfully reminded in this Chamber that pending measures against slavery are unconstitutional. Sir, this is an immense mistake. *Nothing against slavery can be unconstitutional*. It is only *hesitation* which is unconstitutional.

And yet slavery still exists—in defiance of all these requirements of the Constitution; nay, more, in defiance of reason and justice, which can never be disobeyed with impunity—it exists, the perpetual spoiler of human rights and disturber of the public peace, degrading master as well as slave, corrupting society, weakening Government, impoverishing the very soil itself, and impairing the natural resources of the country. Such an outrage, so offensive in every respect, not only to the Constitution, but also to the whole system of order by which the universe is governed, is plainly a *national nuisance*, which, for the general welfare and in the name of justice, ought to be abated. But at this moment, when it menaces the national life, it will not be enough to treat slavery merely as a nuisance; for it is much more. It is a public enemy and traitor wherever it shows itself, to be subdued, in the discharge of solemn guarantees of Government and of personal rights, and in the exercise of unquestionable and indefeasible rights of *self-defence*. All now admit that in the rebel States it is a *public enemy and traitor*, so that the rebellion may be seen in slavery, and slavery may be seen in the rebellion. But slavery throughout the country, everywhere within the national limits, is a *living unit, one and indivisible*—so that even outside the rebel States it is the same public enemy and traitor, lending succor to the rebellion, and holding out

"blue lights" to encourage and direct its operations. But whether regarded as national nuisance or as public enemy and traitor, it is obnoxious to the same judgment and must be abolished.

If, in abolishing slavery, any injury were done to the just interests of any human being or to any rights of any kind, there might be something "to give us pause," even against these irresistible requirements. But nothing of the kind can ensue. No just interests and no rights can suffer. It is the rare felicity of such an act, as well outside as inside the rebel States, that, while striking a blow at the rebellion, and assuring future tranquillity, so that the Republic shall no longer be a house divided against itself, it will add at once to the value of the whole fee simple wherever slavery exists, will secure individual rights, and will advance civilization itself.

There is another motive to abolish slavery at this time. Embattled armies now stand face to face, on the one side fighting for slavery. The gauntlet that has been flung down we have yet taken up only in part. In abolishing slavery entirely we take up the gauntlet entirely. Then can we look with confidence to the blessings of Almighty God upon our arms. "'Till America comes into this measure," said John Jay during the Revolution, "her prayers to Heaven will be impious." So long as we sustain slavery, so long as we hesitate to strike at it, the heavy battalions of our armies will fail in power. Sir Giles Overreach found his sword, as he attempted to draw it, "glued with orphan's tears." Let not our soldiers find their swords "glued" with the tears of the slave.

There is one question and only one which rises in our path; and this only because the national representatives have so long been drugged and drenched with slavery, which they have taken in all forms, whether of dose or *douche*, that, like a long-suffering patient, they are not yet emancipated from its influence. I refer, of course, to the question of compensation under the shameful assumption that there can be property in man. Sir, there was a moment when I was willing to pay money largely, or at least to any reasonable amount, for emancipation; but it was as *ransom*, and never as compensation. Thank God! that time has now passed, never to return; and simply because money is no longer needed for the purpose. Our fathers under Washington never paid the Algerines for the emancipation of our enslaved fellow-citizens, except as ransom, and they ceased all such tribute when emancipation could be had without it. Such must be our rule now. Any other rule would be to impoverish the Treasury for nothing. The time has come for the old tocsin to sound, "Millions for defense, not a cent for tribute." Ay, sir; millions of dollars—with millions of strong arms also—to defend our country against slave-masters; but not a cent for tribute to slave-masters.

But if money is to be paid as compensation, clearly it cannot go to the master, who for generations has robbed the slave of his toil and all its fruits, so that, in justice, he may be regarded now as the trustee of accumulated earnings with interest which he has never paid over. Any money paid as compensation must belong, every dollar of it, to the slave. If the case were audited in Heaven's chancery, there must be

another allowance for the denial of inestimable rights. The loss of wages may be estimated, but where is the tariff or price-current by which those other losses which have been the lot of every slave shall be determined? Mortal arithmetic is impotent to assess the fearful sum total. In presence of this infinite responsibility the whole question must be referred to that other tribunal where master and slave will be equal, while infinite wisdom tempers justice with mercy.

But the proposition of compensation is founded on the intolerable assumption of property in man, an idea which often intrudes into these debates, sometimes from its open vindicators and sometimes from others who reluctantly recognize it, but allow it to influence their conduct which is thus "steklied o'er" with slavery. Sir, parliamentary law must be observed; but if an outburst of indignant hisses were ever justifiable in a parliamentary assembly it ought to break forth at every mention of this proposition, whatever form it may take—whether of daring assumption, or the mildest suggestion, or equivocation even. Impious toward God and insulting toward man, it is disowned alike by the conscience and the reason; nor is there any softness of argument or phrase by which its essential wickedness can be disguised. The fool hath said in his heart that there is no God; but it is kindred folly to say that there is no Man. The first is atheism, and the second is like unto the first.

Foremost of all persons in history who have vindicated human liberty, and associated their names with it forevermore, stands John Milton, the secretary of Oliver Cromwell and the author of *Paradise Lost*. Cradled under a lawless royalty, he helped to found and support the English Commonwealth, while in all that he wrote he pleaded for human rights, now in defense of the English people, who had beheaded their king, and now in immortal poems which show how wisely and well he loved the cause which he had made his own. Nowhere has this assumption of property in man been encountered more completely, than in the conversation between the archangel and Adam, after the former had pictured a hunter whose game was "men, not beasts."

"O execrable son! so to aspire  
Above his brethren, to himself assuming!  
Authority usurped, from God not given!  
He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,  
Dominion absolute; that right we hold  
By His donation; but man over men  
He made not lord, such title to Himself  
Reserving, human left from human free."

*Paradise Lost, Book Twelve—64-73.*

But every asserter of property in man puts himself in the very place of this hunter of "men, not beasts," who is described as "execrable son so to aspire." The language is strong; but not too strong. "Execrable" is the assumption; "execrable" wherever made; "execrable" on the plantation; "execrable" in this chamber; "execrable" in all its forms; "execrable" in all its consequences; especially "execrable" as an apology for hesitation against slavery. The assumption, wherever it shows itself, must like Satan himself, in whom it has its origin, be beaten down under our feet.

Again, we are brought by learned Senators to the Constitution, which requires that there shall be "just compensation" where "private property"

is taken for public use. But plainly on the present occasion the requirement of the Constitution is absolutely inapplicable, for there is no "private property" to take. Slavery is but a bundle of barbarous pretensions, from which certain persons are to be released. At what price shall these pretensions be estimated? How much shall be paid for the controlling pretension of property in man? How much shall be allowed for that other pretension to shut the gates of knowledge, and keep the victim from the book of life? How much shall be expended to redeem the pretension to rob a human being of all the fruits of his toil? And, sir, what "just compensation" shall be voted for the renunciation of that Heaven-defying pretension, too disgusting to picture, which, trampling on the most sacred relations, makes wife and child the wretched prey of lust or avarice? Let these pretensions be renounced, and slavery ceases to exist; but there can be no "just compensation" for any such renunciation. The human heart, reason, religion, the Constitution itself, rise in judgment against it. As well vote "just compensation" to the hardened offender who renounces his disobedience to the Ten Commandments and promises that he will cease to steal, that he will cease to commit adultery, and that he will cease to covet his neighbor's wife. Aye, sir, there is nothing in the Constitution to sanction any such outrage. Such an appropriation would be unconstitutional.

Mr. Madison said in the convention that "it was wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea that there could be property in man." (3 Madison Papers, 1629.) Of course it was wrong. It was criminal and unpardonable. Thank God! it was not done. But Senators admit this "idea" daily. They take it from themselves, and then introduce it where Mr. Madison said it was "wrong." But if it was "wrong" at the adoption of the Constitution to do this thing, how much worse is it now! There is no instinct of patriotism, as there is no conclusion of reason, which must not be against the abomination; and yet, sir, it is allowed to enter into these debates. Sometimes it stalks, and sometimes it skulks; but whether stalking or skulking, it must be encountered with the same indignant rebuke, until it shall no longer venture to show its head.

Putting aside, then, all objections that have been interposed, whether proceeding from open opposition or from lukewarm support, the great question recurs—that question which dominates this whole debate; how shall slavery be overthrown? The answer is three-fold: first, by the courts, declaring and applying the true principles of the Constitution; secondly, by Congress, in the exercise of the powers which belong to it; and, thirdly, by the people, through an amendment to the Constitution. Courts, Congress, people, all may be invoked, and the occasion will justify the appeal.

1. Let the appeal be made to the courts. But alas! one of the saddest chapters in our history has been the conduct of judges, who have lent themselves to the support of slavery. Injunctions of the Constitution, guarantees of personal liberty, and prohibitions against its invasion, have all been forgotten. Courts, which should have been asylums of liberty, have been changed into *barracoons*, and the Supreme Court of

the United States, by a final decision of surpassing infamy, became the greatest *barracoon* of all. It has been part of the calamity of the times, that, under the influence of slavery, justice, like Astraea of old, had fled. But now at last, in a regenerated Republic, with the power of slavery waning, and the people rising in judgment against it, let us hope that the judgments of courts may be reconsidered, and that the powers of the Constitution in behalf of liberty may be fully exercised, so that human bondage shall no longer find an unnatural support from the lips of judges,

"—— and ancient frauds shall fail,  
Returning Justice lift aloft her scale."

Sir, no court can afford to do an act of wrong. Its business is justice; and when, under any apology, it ceases to do justice, it loses those titles to reverence which otherwise are so willingly bestowed. There are instances of great magistrates who have openly declared their disobedience to laws "against common right and reason," and their names are mentioned with gratitude in the history of jurisprudence. There are other instances of men holding the balance and the sword, whose names have been gathered into a volume as "atrocious judges." If our judges, who have cruelly interpreted the Constitution in favor of slavery, do not come into the latter class, they clearly can claim no place among those others who have stood for justice, like the rock on which the sea breaks in idle spray. Vainly do you attempt to frame injustice into a law, or to sanctify it by any judgment of court. From Cicero we learn that "if laws were made merely by the ordinances of the people, the decrees of princes, or the sentences of judges, then the setting up forged wills might be lawful, adultery might be lawful," (*De Legibus*, Lib. I, § 17;) and Augustine tells us, with saintly authority, that what is unjust cannot be law. Every law and every judgment of court, to be binding, must have at its back the everlasting, irrepealable law of God. Doubtless the model decision of the American bench, destined to be quoted hereafter with the most honor, because the boldest in its conformity with the great principles of humanity and social order, was that of the Vermont judge, who refused to surrender a fugitive slave, *until his pretended master should show a title-deed from the Almighty.*

But the courts have no longer any occasion for such boldness. They need not step outside the Constitution. It is only needed that they should follow just principles in its interpretation. Let them be guided by a teacher like Edmund Burke, who spoke as follows.

"Men cannot covenant themselves out of their rights and their duties; nor by any other means can arbitrary power be conveyed to any man. Those who give to others such rights, perform acts that are void as they are given." \* \* \* \* \*

\* \* \* "Those who give and those who receive arbitrary power are alike criminal, and there is no man but is bound to resist it to the best of his power, wherever it shall show its face in the world." It is a crime to bear it wherever it can be rationally shaken off."—*Speech on impeachment of Warren Hastings.*

Or let them be guided by that other teacher, Lord Chatham, when he said :

"With respect to the decisions of the courts of justice I am far from denying their due weight and authority; yet placing them in the most respectable view, I will consider them, not as law, but as an evidence of the law; and before they can arrive even at that degree of authority, it must appear that they are founded in, and confirmed by,

reason; that they are supported by precedents, taken from good and moderate times; that they do not contradict any positive law; that they are submitted to without reluctance by the people; that they are unquestioned by the legislature, (which is equivalent to a tacit confirmation,) and what in my judgment is by far the most important, that they do not violate the spirit of the constitution." —Speech of Lord Chatham in 1770, with regard to the proceedings on the Middlesex election.

If courts were thus inspired, it is easy to see that slavery would disappear under their righteous judgments.

2. But unhappily the courts will not perform the duty of the hour, and we must look elsewhere. An appeal must be made to Congress; and here, as has been fully developed, the powers are ample, unless in their interpretation you surrender in advance to slavery. By a single brief statute, Congress may sweep slavery out of existence. Patrick Henry saw and declared that, under the influence of a growing detestation of slavery and the increasing "urbanity" of the people, this must be expected, while all the capacious war powers proclaim trumpet-tongued that it can be done constitutionally, and the peace powers now echo back the war powers.

Of course we encounter here again the "execrable" pretension of property in man, and the claim of "just compensation" for the renunciation of Heaven-defying wrongs. But this pretension is no more applicable to abolition by act of Congress than to abolition by an amendment of the Constitution; so that if the claim of "just compensation" can be discarded in one case it can be in the other. But the votes that have already been taken in the Senate on the latter proposition testify that it is discarded. Sir, let the "execrable" pretension never again be named, except for condemnation, no matter how or when it appears or what the form it may take. Let the "idea," which was originally branded as so "wrong" that it could not find a place in the Constitution, never find a place in our debates.

But even if Congress be not prepared for that single decisive measure which shall promptly put an end to this whole question and strike slavery to death, there are other measures by which this end may be hastened. The towering Upas may be girdled, even if it may not be felled at once to the earth. Already, by acts of Congress, slavery has been abolished in the national capital and in the national territories. But this is not enough.

The fugitive slave bill, conceived in iniquity and imposed upon the North as a badge of subjugation, may be repealed.

The coastwise slave trade may be deprived of all support in the statute book.

The traffic in human beings, as an article of "commerce among the States," may be extirpated.

And, above all, that odious rule of evidence, so injurious to justice and discreditable to the country, excluding the testimony of colored persons in national courts, may be abolished.

And there is one other thing which must be done. The enlistment of colored persons must be encouraged by legislation in every possible form; for enlistment is emancipation. That contract by which the soldier-slave promises service at the hazard of life, like the contract of marriage, fixes the equality of the parties, which Congress, for the

national defence, and the national character also, must sacredly maintain.

All these things at least may be done, and when they are done, Heaven and earth will be glad; for they will see an assurance that all will be done.

But all these will not be enough. The people must be summoned to confirm the whole work. It is for them to put the cap-stone upon the sublime structure. An amendment of the Constitution may do what courts and Congress decline to do, or, even should they act, it may cover their action with its panoply. Such an amendment, in any event, will give completeness and permanence to emancipation and bring the Constitution into avowed harmony with the Declaration of Independence. Happy day, long wished for, destined to gladden those beatified spirits who have labored on earth to this end, but died without the sight.

And yet let us not indiscreetly take counsel of our hopes. From the nature of the case such an amendment cannot be consummated at once. Time must intervene, with opportunities of opposition. It can pass Congress only by a vote of two-thirds of both branches. And when it has passed both branches of Congress it must be adopted by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States. Even under the most favorable circumstances it is impossible to say when it can become a part of the Constitution. Too tardily, I fear, for all the good that is sought. Therefore I am not content with this measure alone. It postpones till to-morrow what ought to be done to-day; and I much fear that it may be made an apology for indifference to other propositions, which are of direct practical significance; as if it were not unpardonable to neglect for a day the duties we owe to Human Rights.

“To-morrow, and to-morrow, and to-morrow,  
Creeps in this petty pace from day to day,  
To the last syllable of recorded time;  
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools  
The way to dusty death.”

For myself let me confess that, in presence of the mighty events of the day, I feel how insignificant is any individual, whether citizen or Senator; and yet, humbly longing to do my part, I cannot consent to put off till to-morrow what ought to be done to-day. Beyond my general desire to see an act of universal emancipation that shall at once and forever settle this great question, so that it may no longer be the occasion of strife between us, there are two other ideas which are ever present to my mind as a practical legislator: first, to strike at slavery wherever I can hit it; and secondly, to clean the statute book of all existing supports of slavery, so that it may find nothing there to which it may cling for life. To do less than this at the present moment, when slavery is still menacing, would be an abandonment of duty.

So long as a single slave continues anywhere beneath the flag of the Republic I am unwilling to rest. Too well I know the vitality of slavery with its infinite capacity of propagation, and how little slavery it takes to make a slave State with all the cruel pretensions of slavery. The down of a single thistle is full of all possible thistles, and a single fish is said to contain two hundred millions of eggs, so that the whole sea might be stocked from its womb.

The founder of political science in modern times, writer as well as statesman, Machiavelli, in his most instructive work, the *Discourses on Livy*, has a chapter entitled, "To have long life in a republic, it is necessary to draw it back often to its origin:" and in the chapter he shows how the original virtue in which a republic was founded becomes so far corrupted, that, in the process of time, the body-politic must be destroyed; as in the case of the natural body, where, according to the doctors of medicine, there is something added daily which perpetually requires cure, *quod quotidie aggregatur aliquid, quod quandoque indiget curatione*. He teaches under this head that republics are brought back to their origin, and the principles in which they were founded, by pressure without where prudence fails within, and he affirms that the destruction of Rome by the Gauls was necessary that the republic might have a new birth, and thus acquire new life and new virtue, all of which ensued when the barbarians had been driven back. The illustration, perhaps, is fanciful, but there is wisdom in the counsel, and now the time has come for its application. The Gauls are upon us, not, however, from a distance, but domestic Gauls, and we, too, may profit by the occasion to secure for the Republic a new birth, that it may acquire new life and new virtue. Happily, in our case the way is easy, for it is only necessary to carry the Republic back to its baptismal vows, and the declared sentiments of its origin. There is the Declaration of Independence: let its solemn promises be redeemed. There is the Constitution: let it speak, according to the promises of the Declaration.

Mr. President, the immediate question now before us is on the proposition to prohibit slavery everywhere throughout the whole country by constitutional amendment; and here I hope to be indulged for a moment with regard to the form which it should take. A new text of the Constitution cannot be considered too carefully even in this respect, especially when it embodies a new article of freedom. Here for a moment we are performing something of that duty which belongs to the *conditores imperii*, placed foremost by Lord Bacon among the actors in human affairs, and "words" become "things." From the magnitude of the task we may naturally borrow circumspection, and I approach this part of the question with suggestion rather than argument.

Let me say frankly that I should prefer a form of expression different from that which has the sanction of the committee. They have selected what was intended for the old Jeffersonian ordinance, sacred in our history, although, let me add, they have not imitated it closely. But I must be pardoned if I venture to doubt the expediency of perpetuating in the Constitution language which, if it have any signification, seems to imply that "slavery or involuntary servitude" may be provided "for the punishment of crime." It is supposed that there was a reason for this language when it was first employed, but that reason no longer exists. There can be no reason why slavery should not be forbidden positively and without exception, especially as "imprisonment" cannot be confounded with this "peculiar" wrong. If my desires could prevail, I would put aside the ordinance on this occasion, and find another form.

I know nothing better than these words:

"All persons are equal before the law, so that no person can hold another as a slave; and the Congress shall have power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry this declaration into effect everywhere within the United States and the jurisdiction thereof."

The words in the latter part supersede all questions as to the applicability of the declaration to the States. But the distinctive words in this clause assert the *equality of all persons before the law*. The language may be new in our country, but it is already well known in history. And here let me show how it has grown to its present place of authority. We must repair for a moment to France.

The first constitution adopted by France, September, 1791, in the throes of revolution, was preceded by a Declaration of Rights, which, after setting forth that "ignor-

ance, forgetfulness, or contempt of the rights of man are the sole causes of public evils and of the corruption of Governments," undertakes to announce "the natural rights of man, inalienable and sacred, to the end that this Declaration, constantly present to all the members of the social system, may without cessation recall their rights and duties; to the end that the acts of the legislative power and those of the executive power capable at each instant of being compared with the object of every political institution, may be more respected; to the end that the claims of citizens, founded on simple and incontestable principles, may turn always to the maintenance of the constitution, and the happiness of all." After this too elaborate preamble the declaration begins with an article, which has a generality of expression, not unlike that of our own Declaration of Independence.

"ART. 1. Men are born and continue free and *equal in rights.*"

Next came the Constitution of June, 1793, which, after a preamble, sets forth a series of articles, beginning with three, as follows:

"ART. 1. The object of society is the common happiness. Government is instituted to guarantee to man the enjoyment of his natural and imprescriptible rights.

"2. These rights are equality, liberty, security, property.

"3. *All men are equal by nature and before the law.*"

Here the declaration in question begins to show itself. Men are equal by nature and before the law.

This same Constitution concludes with what is called a guaranty of rights, in the following article:

"ART. 122. The Constitution guarantees to all Frenchmen equality, liberty, security, property, the public debt, the free exercise of worship, common instruction, public assistance, the indefinite liberty of the press, the right of petition, the right to assemble in public meetings, the enjoyment of all the rights of men."

Then came the constitutional charter of June, 1814, following the restoration of the Bourbons, which begins in the following article:

"ART. 1. Frenchmen are equal before the law, whatever may be otherwise their title and ranks."

This is followed by another, as follows:

"ART. 4. Their individual liberty is equally garantied, so that nobody can be prosecuted or arrested except in cases provided for by law, and in the form which it prescribes."

The constitutional charter of August, 1830, at the installation of Louis Philippe as king, with La Fayette by his side, contains the articles already quoted from that of Louis XVIII, in the same words, placing the declaration of *equality before the law* in the front.

And this article has been adopted in the charters of Belgium, Italy, Greece; so that it is now the well-known expression of a commanding principle of human rights.

It will be felt at once that this expression, "*equality before the law,*" gives precision to that idea of human rights which is enunciated in our Declaration of Independence. The sophistries of Calhoun, founded on the obvious inequalities of body and mind, are all overthrown by this simple statement, which, though borrowed latterly from France, is older than French history. The curious student will find in the ancient Greek of Herodotus a single word which supplies the place of this phrase, when he tell us that "the government of the many has the most beautiful name of "*ισονομία*," or *equality before the law.* (Book 3, p. 80.) The father of history was right. The name is most beautiful; but it is not a little singular that, in an age when *equality before the law* was practically unknown, the Greek language, so remarkable for its flexibility and comprehensiveness, supplied a single word, not to be found in modern tongues, to express an idea which has been authoritatively recognized only in modern times. Such a word in our own language to express that equality of rights which is claimed for all mankind might have superseded some of the criticism to which this declaration has been exposed.

Enough has been said to explain the origin of the expression which is now proposed. Though traced to distant antiquity and now adopted in various countries, it derives its modern authority from France, where it is the "well-ripened fruit" of an unprecedented experience in the discussion of great problems of political science. Naturally, it does not come from England; for the idea itself finds little favor in that hierarchical kingdom. In France equality prevails more than liberty. In England liberty prevails more than equality. Here among us both should find a home, and such a declaration as I now propose, embodying *liberty and equality*, will keep the double idea perpetually in the public mind and conscience, "to warn, to comfort, and command." The denial of Liberty in the rebel States begins with a denial of Equality, so that our work is not completely done without the assertion of both principles.

"Slavery shall not exist anywhere within the United States or the jurisdiction thereof; and the Congress shall have power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry this prohibition into effect."

"Slavery shall not exist anywhere within the United States or the jurisdiction thereof; and the Congress shall have power to make all laws necessary and proper to carry this prohibition into effect."

This is simple, and avoids all language which is open to question. The word "slavery" is explicit, and describes precisely what it is proposed to blast. There is no doubt with regard to its signification. It cannot be confounded with "the punishment of crimes:" for imprisonment is not slavery; nor can any punishment take the form of a wrong which stands by itself, peculiar, terrible, outrageous. Therefore nothing about punishment should find a place in the rule which we ordain.

But if the Senate is determined to adhere to the Jeffersonian ordinance, then I prefer that it should be the ordinance actually, and not as reported by the committee. And I would complete the work by expelling from the Constitution all those words which have been misconstrued, perverted and tortured to a false support of slavery.

But while desirous of seeing the great rule of freedom which we are about to ordain embodied in a text which shall be like the precious casket to the more precious treasure, yet I confess that I feel humbled by my own endeavors. And whatever may be the judgment of the Senate, I am consoled by the thought that the most homely text containing such a rule will be more beautiful far than any words of poetry or eloquence, and that it will endure to be read with gratitude when the rising dome of this capitol, with the statue of liberty which surrounds it, has crumbled to dust.

H. Polkinhorn, printer, 375 and 377 D street, near Seventh, Washington, D. C.

4  
*Ed. & Daily Advertiser*

THE  
ANTI-SLAVERY ENTERPRISE:

FOR ITS

NECESSITY, PRACTICABILITY, AND DIGNITY,

WITH GLIMPSES AT THE

SPECIAL DUTIES OF THE NORTH.

AN

ADDRESS

BEFORE

THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK,

AT THE

METROPOLITAN THEATRE, MAY 9, 1855.

BY

CHARLES SUMNER.

BOSTON:

TICKNOR AND FIELDS.

M DCCC LV.



THE  
ANTI-SLAVERY ENTERPRISE:  
ITS  
NECESSITY, PRACTICABILITY, AND DIGNITY,  
WITH GLIMPSES AT THE  
SPECIAL DUTIES OF THE NORTH.

---

A N  
A D D R E S S  
BEFORE  
THE PEOPLE OF NEW YORK,  
AT THE  
METROPOLITAN THEATRE, MAY 9, 1855.

BY  
CHARLES SUMNER.

BOSTON:  
TICKNOR AND FIELDS.  
M DCCC LV.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1855, by  
TICKNOR AND FIELDS,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

CAMBRIDGE: THURSTON AND TORKY, PRINTERS.

# A D D R E S S.

---

MR. PRESIDENT AND FELLOW-CITIZENS OF NEW YORK.

HISTORY abounds in vicissitudes. From weakness and humility, men ascend to power and place. From defeat and disparagement, enterprises are lifted to triumph and acceptance. The martyr of to-day is gratefully enshrined on the morrow. The stone that the builders rejected is made the head of the corner. Thus it always has been, and ever will be.

Only twenty years ago,—in 1835,—the friends of the slave in our country were weak and humble, while their great Enterprise, just then showing itself, was trampled down and despised. The small companies, gathered together in the name of Freedom, were interrupted and often dispersed by riotous mobs. At Boston, a feeble association of women, called the Female Anti-Slavery Society, convened in a small room of an upper story in an obscure building, was insulted and then driven out of doors by a frantic crowd, politely termed at the time, an assemblage of “gentlemen of property and standing,” which, after various deeds of violence and vileness, next directed itself upon William Lloyd Garrison,—known as the determined editor of the *Liberator*, and the originator of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise in our day,—then ruthlessly tearing him away, amidst savage threats and with a halter about his neck, dragged him through the streets, until, at last, guilty only of loving liberty, if not wisely, too well,

this unoffending citizen was thrust into the common jail for protection against an infuriate populace. Nor was Boston alone. Even villages in remote rural solitude, belched forth in similar outrage; while the large towns, like Providence, New Haven, Utica, Worcester, Alton, Cincinnati, Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York, became so many fiery craters, overflowing with rage and madness. What lawless violence failed to accomplish was next urged through the forms of law. By solemn legislative acts, the Slave States called on the Free States "promptly and effectually to suppress all associations within their respective limits purporting to be Abolition Societies;" and Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and New York, basely hearkened to the base proposition. The press, too, with untold power, exerted itself in this behalf, while the pulpit, the politician, and the merchant, conspired to stifle discussion, until the voice of Freedom was hushed to a whisper, "alas! almost afraid to know itself."

Since then—in the lapse of a few years only—a change has taken place. Instead of those small companies, counted by tens, we have now this mighty assembly, counted by thousands; instead of an insignificant apartment, like that in Boston, the mere appendage of a printing-office, where, as in the manger itself, Truth was cradled, we have now this Metropolitan Hall, ample in proportions and central in place; instead of a profane and clamorous mob, beating at our gates, dispersing our assembly, and making one of our number the victim of its fury, we have now peace and harmony at unguarded doors, ruffled only by a generous competition to participate in this occasion; while legislatures openly declare their sympathies; villages, towns and cities vie in the new manifestation; and the press itself, with increased power, heralds, applauds and extends the prevailing influence, which, overflowing from every fountain, and pouring through every channel, at last, by the awakened voice of pulpit, politician and merchant, swells into an irrepressible cry.

Here is a great change, worthy of notice and memory, for it attests the first stage of victory. Slavery, in all its many-sided wrongs, still continues; but here in this metropolis,—ay, Sir, and throughout the whole North,—freedom of discuss-

sion is at length secured. And this, I say, is the first stage of victory — herald of the transcendent Future;

“ Hark ! a glad voice the lonely desert cheers ;  
 Prepare the way ! a God, a God appears !  
 A God ! a God ! the vocal hills reply,  
 The rocks proclaim th’ approaching Deity.”

Nor is there any thing peculiar in the trials to which our cause has been exposed. Thus in all ages has Truth been encountered. At first persecuted, gagged, silenced, crucified, she has cried out from the prison, from the torture, from the stake, from the cross, until at last her voice has been heard. And when that voice is really heard, whether in martyr cries, or in the earthquake tones of civil convulsion, or in the calmness of ordinary speech, such as I now employ, or in that still small utterance inaudible to the common ear, then is the beginning of victory! “ Give me where to stand, and I will move the world,” said Archimedes; and Truth asks no more than did the master of geometry.

Viewed in this aspect, the present occasion rises above any ordinary course of lectures or series of political meetings. It is the inauguration of Freedom. From this time forward, her voice of warning and command cannot be silenced. The sensitive sympathies of property may, in this commercial mart, once again recognize property in man; the watchful press itself may falter or fail, but the vantage-ground of free discussion now achieved cannot be lost. On this I take my stand, and, as from the Mount of Vision, behold the whole field of our great controversy spread before me. There is no point, topic, fact, matter, reason or argument, touching the question between Slavery and Freedom, which is not now open. Of all these I might, perhaps, aptly select some one and confine myself to its development. But I should not, in this way, best satisfy the seeming requirements of the occasion. According to the invitation of your Committee, I was to make an address, introductory to the present course of lectures, but was prevented by ill-health. And now, at the close of the course, I am to say what I failed to say at its beginning. Not as caucus or as Congress can I address you; nor am I moved to undertake a political harangue or constitutional argument. Out

of the occasion let me speak, and, discarding any individual topic, aim to exhibit the entire field, in all its divisions and subdivisions, with all its metes and bounds.

My subject will be THE NECESSITY, PRACTICABILITY AND DIGNITY OF THE ANTI-SLAVERY ENTERPRISE, WITH GLIMPSES AT THE SPECIAL DUTIES OF THE NORTH. By this Enterprise I do not mean the efforts of any restricted circle, sect or party, but the cause of the slave, in all its forms and degrees, and under all its names,—whether inspired by the pulpit, the press, the economist or the politician,—whether in the early, persistent and comprehensive demands of Garrison, the gentler utterances of Channing, or the strictly constitutional endeavors of others now actually sharing the public councils of the country. To carry through this review, under its different heads, I shall not hesitate to meet the objections which have been urged against it, so far, at least, as I am aware of them. And now, as I address you seriously, I venture to ask your serious attention even to the end. Not easily can a public address reach that highest completeness which is found in mingling the useful and the agreeable; but I desire to say, that, in this arrangement and co-ordination of my remarks to-night, I seek to cultivate that highest courtesy of a speaker, which is found in clearness.

I. I begin with the NECESSITY of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise. In the wrong of Slavery, *as defined by existing law*, this necessity is plainly apparent; nor can any man within the sound of my voice, who listens to the authentic words of the law, hesitate in my conclusion. A wrong so grievous and unquestionable should not be allowed to continue. For the honor of human nature, and for the good of all concerned, *it should at once cease to exist*. On this simple statement, as a corner-stone, I found the necessity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise.

I do not dwell, Sir, on the many tales which come from the house of bondage; on the bitter sorrows there undergone; on the flesh, galled by the manacle or spirting blood beneath the lash; on the human form mutilated by the knife, or seared by

red-hot iron ; on the ferocious scent of blood-hounds in chase of human prey ; on the sale of fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, little children — even infants — at the auction-block ; on the practical prostration of all rights, all ties, and even all hope ; on the deadly injury to morals, substituting concubinage for marriage, and changing the whole land of slavery into a by-word of shame, only fitly pictured by the language of Dante when he called his own degraded country a House of Ill Fame ; and, last of all, on the pernicious influence upon the master as well as the slave, showing itself too often, even by his own confession, in rudeness of manners and character, and especially in that blindness which renders him insensible to the wrong he upholds, while he,

“ — so perfect is his misery,  
Not once perceives his foul disfigurement,  
But boasts himself more comely than before.”

On these things I do not dwell, although volumes are at hand of unquestionable facts and of illustrative story, so just and happy as to vie with fact, out of which I might draw, until, like Macbeth, you had supped full of horrors.

But all these I put aside ; not because I do not regard them of moment in exhibiting the true character of slavery, but because I desire to present this argument on grounds above all controversy, impeachment, or suspicion, even from slave-masters themselves. Not on triumphant story, not even on indisputable facts, do I now accuse Slavery, but on its character, as revealed in its own simple definition of itself. Out of its own mouth do I condemn it. By the *law of Slavery*, man, created in the image of God, is divested of his human character, and declared to be a mere chattel. That this statement may not seem to be put forward without precise authority, I quote the law of two different States. The civil code of Louisiana thus defines a slave :—

“ A slave is one who is in the power of a master to whom he belongs. The master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labor. He can do nothing, possess nothing, nor acquire any thing but what must belong to his master.” — *Civil Code*, Art. 35.

The law of another polished slave State gives this definition ;

"Slaves shall be deemed, sold, taken, reputed and adjudged in law to be *chattels personal*, in the hands of their owners, and possessors, and their executors, administrators and assignees, to all intents, constructions and purposes whatsoever."—2 *Brev. Dig.* 229.

And a careful writer, Judge Stroud, in a work of juridical as well as philanthropic merit, thus sums up the law:

"The cardinal principle of Slavery—that the slave is not to be ranked among *sentient* beings, but among *things*—is an article of property—a chattel personal—obtains as undoubted law in all of these (the slave) States."—*Stroud's Laws of Slavery*, 22.

Sir, this is enough. As out of its small egg crawls forth the slimy, scaly reptile crocodile, so out of this simple definition crawls forth the whole slimy, scaly reptile monstrosity, by which a man is changed into a chattel,—a person is converted into a thing,—a soul is transmuted into merchandise. According to this very definition, the slave is held simply for the good of his master, to whose behests, his life, liberty and happiness are devoted, and by whom he may be bartered, leased, mortgaged, bequeathed, invoiced, shipped as cargo, stored as goods, sold on execution, knocked off at public auction, and even staked at the gaming-table on the hazard of a card or die. The slave may seem to have a wife; but he has not; for his wife belongs to his master. He may seem to have a child; but he has not; for his child belongs to his master. He may be filled with the desire of knowledge, opening to him the gates of hope on earth and in heaven; but the master may impiously close this sacred pursuit. Thus is he robbed not merely of privileges, but of himself; not merely of money and labor, but of wife and children; not merely of time and opportunity, but of every assurance of happiness; not merely of earthly hope, but of all those divine aspirations that spring from the fountain of light. He is not merely restrained in liberty, but totally deprived of it; not merely curtailed in rights, but absolutely stripped of them; not merely loaded with burthens, but changed into a beast of burthen; not merely bent in countenance to the earth, but sunk to the legal level of a quadruped; not merely exposed to personal cruelty, but deprived of his character as a person; not merely compelled to involuntary labor, but degraded to be a rude thing; not merely shut out from knowledge, but wrest-

ed from his place in the human family. *And all this, Sir, is according to the simple law of Slavery.*

Nor is even this all. The law, by cumulative provisions, positively forbids that a slave shall be taught to read. Hear this, fellow citizens, and confess, that no barbarism of despotism, no extravagance of tyranny, no excess of impiety can be more blasphemous or deadly. "Train up the child in the way he should go," is the lesson of sacred wisdom; but the law of slavery boldly prohibits any such training, and dooms the child to hopeless ignorance and degradation. "Let there be light," was the Divine utterance at the very dawn of creation,—and this commandment, travelling with the ages and the hours, still speaks with the voice of God; but the law of Slavery says, "Let there be darkness."

But it is earnestly averred that slave-masters are humane, and that slaves are treated with kindness. These averments, however, I properly put aside, precisely as I have already put aside the multitudinous illustrations from the cruelty of Slavery. On the simple letter of the law I take my stand, and do not go beyond what is there nominated. The masses of men are not better than their laws, and, whatever may be the eminence of individual virtue, it is not reasonable to infer that the masses of slave-masters are better than the law of Slavery. And, since this law submits the slave to their irresponsible control, with power to bind and to scourge—to shut the soul from knowledge—to separate families—to unclasp the infant from a mother's breast, and the wife from a husband's arms,—it is natural to conclude that such enormities are sanctioned by them, while the brutal prohibition of instruction by supplementary law gives crowning evidence of their complete complicity. And this conclusion must exist unquestioned, just so long as the law exists unrepealed. Cease, then, to blazon the humanity of slave-masters. Tell me not of the lenity with which this cruel law is tempered to its unhappy subjects. Tell me not of the sympathy which overflows from the mansion of the master to the cabin of the slave. In vain you assert these instances. In vain you show that there are individuals who do not exert the wickedness of the law. The law still endures. The institution of Slavery, which it defines

and upholds, continues to outrage Public Opinion, and, within the limits of our Republic, upwards of three millions of human beings, guilty only of a skin not colored like your own, are left the victims of its unrighteous, irresponsible power.

Power divorced from right is devilish; power without the check of responsibility is tyrannical; and I need not go back to the authority of Plato, when I assert, that the most complete injustice is that which is erected into the form of law. But all these things concur in Slavery. It is, then, on the testimony of slave-masters, solemnly, legislatively, judicially attested in the very law itself, that I now arraign this institution, as an outrage upon man and his Creator. And here is the necessity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise. A wrong so transcendent, so loathsome, so direful, must be encountered *wherever it can be reached*, and the battle must be continued without truce or compromise, until the field is entirely won. Freedom and Slavery can hold no divided empire; nor can there be any true repose until Freedom is every where established.

To the necessity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, there are two and only two vital objections; one founded on the alleged distinction of race, and the other on the alleged sanction of Christianity. All other objections are of an inferior character, or are directed logically at its practicability. Of these two leading objections, let me briefly speak.

1. And, first, of the alleged *distinction of race*. This objection itself assumes two different forms, one founded on a prophetic malediction in the Old Testament, and the other on the professed observations of recent science. Its importance is apparent in the obvious fact, that, unless such distinction be clearly and unmistakably established, every argument by which our own freedom is vindicated,—every applause awarded to the successful rebellion of our fathers,—every indignant word ever hurled against the enslavement of our white fellow-citizens by Algerine corsairs, must plead trumpet-tongued against the deep damnation of Slavery, whether white or black.

It is said that the Africans are the posterity of Ham, the son of Noah, through Canaan, who was cursed by Noah, to be the servant of his brethren, and that this malediction has fallen

upon all his descendants, including the unhappy Africans,—who are accordingly devoted by God, through unending generations, to unending bondage. Such is the favorite argument often put forth at the South, and more than once directly addressed to myself. Here, for instance, is a passage from a letter recently received; “You need not persist,” says the writer, “in confounding Japheth’s children with Ham’s, and making both races one, and arguing on their rights as those of man broadly.” And I have been seriously assured that until this objection is answered, it will be in vain to press my views upon Congress or the country. Listen now to the texts of the Old Testament which are so strangely employed ;

“And he [Noah] said, cursed be Canaan ; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said, Blessed be the Lord God of Shem ; and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant.”—*Genesis*. chap. ix. 25–27.

That is all ; and I need only read these words in order to expose the whole transpicuous humbug. But I am tempted to add, that, to justify this objection, it will be necessary to maintain at least five different propositions, as essential links in the chain of the African slave ; *first*, that, by this malediction, Canaan himself was actually changed into a chattel, whereas, he is simply made the servant of his brethren ; *secondly*, that not merely Canaan, but all his posterity, to the remotest generation, was so changed, whereas the language has no such extent ; *thirdly*, that the African actually belongs to the posterity of Canaan,—an ethnographical assumption absurdly difficult to establish ; *fourthly*, that each of the descendants of Shem or Japheth has a right to hold an African fellow-man as a chattel,—a proposition which finds no semblance of support ; and, *fifthly*, that every slave-master is truly descended from Shem or Japheth,—a pedigree which no anxiety or audacity can prove ! This plain analysis, which may fitly excite a smile, shows the five-fold absurdity of an attempt to found this revolting wrong on

“Any successive title, long and dark,  
Drawn from the musty rolls of Noah’s ark.”

The small bigotry, which could find comfort in these texts, has been lately exalted by the suggestion of science, that the

different races of men are not derived from a single pair, but from several distinct stocks, according to their several distinct characteristics; and it has been audaciously argued that the African is so far inferior, as to lose all title to that liberty which is the birthright of the lordly white. Now I have neither time nor disposition on this occasion, to discuss the question of the unity of the races; nor is it necessary to my present purpose. It may be that the different races of men proceeded from different stocks; but there is but *one* great Human Family, in which Caucasian and African, Chinese and Indian, are all brothers, children of *one* Father, and heirs to *one* happiness,—alike on earth and in heaven. “Star-eyed science” cannot shake this everlasting truth. It may vainly exhibit peculiarities in the African, by which he is distinguishable from the Caucasian. It may, in his physical form and intellectual character, presume to find the stamp of permanent inferiority. But by no reach of learning, by no torture of fact, by no effrontery of dogma, can it show that he is not *a man*. And as a man he stands before you an unquestionable member of the Human Family, and entitled to *all the rights of man*. You can claim nothing for yourself, *as man*, which you must not accord to him. *Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness*,—which you proudly declare to be your own inalienable, God-given rights, and to the support of which your fathers pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor, are his by the same immortal title that they are yours.

2. From the objection founded on the alleged distinction of race, I pass to that other founded on the alleged *sanction of Slavery by Christianity*. And, striving to be brief, I shall not undertake to reconcile texts often quoted from the Old Testament, which, whatever may be their import, are all absorbed in the New; nor shall I stop to consider the precise interpretation of the oft-quoted phrase, *Servants, obey your masters*; nor seek to weigh any such imperfect injunction in the scales against those grand commandments, on which hang all the law and the prophets. Surely, in the example and teachings of the Saviour, who lifted up the down-trodden, who enjoined purity of life, and overflowed with tenderness even to little children, human ingenuity can find no

apology for an institution which tramples on man,— which defiles woman,— and sweeps little children beneath the hammer of the auctioneer. If to any one these things seem to have the license of Christianity, it is only because they have first secured a license in his own soul. Men are prone to find in uncertain, disconnected texts, a confirmation of their own personal prejudices or prepossessions. And I—who am no divine, but only a simple layman—make bold to say, that whoever finds in the Gospel any sanction of Slavery, finds there merely a reflection of himself. On a matter so irresistibly clear, authority is superfluous; but an eminent character, who as poet makes us forget his high place as philosopher, and as philosopher, makes us forget his high place as theologian, has exposed the essential antagonism between Christianity and Slavery, in a few pregnant words which you will be glad to hear,—particularly as, I believe, they have not been before introduced into this discussion. “By a principle essential to Christianity,” says Coleridge, “a person is eternally differenced from a *thing*; so that the *idea of a Human Being necessarily excludes the idea of property in that Being*.”

With regret, though not with astonishment, I learn that a Boston divine has sought to throw the seamless garment of Christ over this shocking wrong. But I am patient, and see clearly how vain will be his effort, when I call to mind, that, within this very century, other divines sought to throw the same seamless garment over the more shocking slave-trade; and that, among many publications, a little book, was then put forth with the name of a reverend clergyman on the title-page, to prove that “the African trade for negro slaves is consistent with the principles of humanity and revealed religion;” and, thinking of these things, I am ready to say with Shakspeare,

“ ————— In religion,  
What damned error, but some sober brow  
Will bless it and approve it with a text?”

In the support of Slavery, it is the habit to pervert texts and to invent authority. Even St. Paul is vouched for a wrong which his Christian life rebukes. Great stress is now laid on his example, as it appears in the epistle to Philemon, written at

Rome, and sent by Onesimus, a servant. From the single chapter constituting the entire epistle, I take the following passage, in ten verses, which is strangely invoked for Slavery;

*“I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds; which in time past was to thee unprofitable, but now profitable to thee and to me; whom I have sent again; thou, therefore, receive him, that is, mine own bowels; whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel; but without thy mind would I do nothing, that thy benefit should not be as it were of necessity, but willingly. For perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever; not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and in the Lord? If thou count me, therefore a partner, receive him as myself. If he hath wronged thee, or oweth thee aught, put that on mine account. I, Paul, have written it with mine own hand, I will repay it; albeit, I do not say to thee how thou owest unto me even thine own self besides.” — Epistle to Philemon, verses 10–19.*

Out of this affectionate epistle, in which St. Paul calls the converted servant, Onesimus, his *son*, precisely as in another epistle he calls Timothy his son, Slavery has been elaborately vindicated, and the great Apostle to the Gentiles has been made the very tutelary saint of the Slave Hunter. Now, without relying on minute criticism, to infer his real judgment of Slavery from his condemnation on another occasion of “men-stealers,” or, according to the original text, *slave-traders*, in company with “murderers of fathers, and murderers of mothers,” and without undertaking to show that the present epistle, when truly interpreted, is a protest against Slavery, and a voice for Freedom,—all of which might be done,—I content myself by calling attention to two things, apparent on its face, and in themselves an all-sufficient response. First, while it appears that Onesimus had been in some way the servant of Philemon, it does not appear that he had ever been held as a slave, much less as a chattel; and how gross and monstrous is the effort to derive a wrong, by which man is changed to a chattel, out of words, whether in the Constitution of our country, or in the Bible, which do not explicitly, unequivocally, and exclusively define this wrong! Secondly, in charging Onesimus with this epistle to Philemon, the Apostle announces him as “not now a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved,” and he enjoins upon his correspondent the hospitality due only to a

freeman, saying expressly, “If thou count me, therefore, a partner, *receive him as myself;*” ay, Sir, not as slave, not even as servant, but as a brother beloved, even as the Apostle himself. Thus with apostolic pen wrote Paul to his disciple, Philemon. Beyond all doubt, in these words of gentleness, benediction, and emancipation, dropping with celestial, soul-awakening power, there can be no justification for a conspiracy, which, beginning with the treachery of Iscariot, and the temptation of pieces of silver, seeks, by fraud, brutality, and violence, through officers of the law armed to the teeth, like pirates, and amidst soldiers who degrade their uniform, to hurl a fellow-man back into the lash-resounding den of American Slavery; and if any one can thus pervert this beneficent example, allow me to say, that he gives too much occasion to doubt his intelligence or his sincerity.

Certainly I am right in thus stripping from Slavery the apology of Christianity, which it has tenaciously hugged; and here I leave the first part of my subject, assuming against every objection the Necessity of our Enterprise.

II. I am now brought, in the *second* place, to consider the PRACTICABILITY of the Enterprise. And here the way is easy. In showing its necessity, I have already demonstrated its practicability; for the former includes the latter, as the greater includes the less. Whatever is necessary must be practicable. By a decree which has ever been a by-word of tyranny, the Israelites were compelled to make bricks without straw; but it is not according to the ways of a benevolent Providence, that man should be constrained to do what cannot be done. What must be done can be done. Besides, the Anti-Slavery Enterprise is necessary because it is right; and the right is always practicable.

I know well the little faith which the world has in the triumph of principles, and I readily imagine the despair with which our object is regarded; but not on this account am I disheartened. That exuberant writer, Sir Thomas Browne, breaks into an ecstatic wish for some new difficulty in Christian belief, that his faith might have a new victory, and an eminent enthusiast went so far as to say, that he believed be-

cause it was impossible — *credo quia impossibile*. But no such exalted faith is now required. Here is no impossibility, nor is there any difficulty which will not yield to a faithful, well-directed endeavor. If to any timid soul the Enterprise seems impossible because it is too beautiful, then I say at once that it is too beautiful not to be possible.

But descending from these summits, let me show plainly the object which it seeks to accomplish, and herein you shall see and confess its complete practicability. While discountenancing all prejudice of color and every establishment of caste, the Anti-Slavery Enterprise — at least so far as I may speak for it — does not undertake to change human nature, or to force any individual into relations of life for which he is not morally, intellectually, and socially adapted; nor does it necessarily assume that a race, degraded for long generations under the iron heel of bondage, can be lifted at once into all the political privileges of an American citizen. But, Sir, it does confidently assume, against all question, contradiction, or assault whatever, *that every man is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; and, with equal confidence, it asserts that every individual, who wears the human form, whether black or white, should at once be recognized as man*. I know not when this is done, what other trials may be in wait for the unhappy African; but I do know, that the Anti-Slavery Enterprise will then have triumphed, and the institution of Slavery, *as defined by existing law*, will no longer shock mankind.

In this work the first essential practical requisite is, that the question shall be openly and frankly confronted. Do not put it aside. Do not blink it out of sight. Do not dodge it. Approach it. Study it. Ponder it. Deal with it. Let it rest in the illumination of speech, conversation, and the press. Let it fill the thoughts of the statesman and the prayers of the pulpit. When Slavery is thus regarded, its true character will be recognized as a hateful assemblage of unquestionable wrongs under the sanction of existing law, and good men will be moved at once to apply the remedy. Already even its zealots admit that its “abuses” should be removed. This is their word and not mine. Alas! alas! Sir, it is these very “abuses” which constitute its component parts, without which it would

not exist, even as the scourges in a bundle with the axe constituted the dread fasces of the Roman lictor. Take away these, and the whole embodied outrage will disappear. Surely that central assumption — more deadly than the axe itself — by which man is changed into a chattel, may be abandoned; and is not this practicable? The associate scourges by which that transcendent "abuse" is surrounded, may, one by one, be subtracted. The "abuse" which substitutes concubinage for marriage — the "abuse" which annuls the parental relation — the "abuse" which closes the portals of knowledge — the "abuse" which tyrannically usurps all the labor of another — now upheld by positive law, may by positive law be abolished. To say that this is not practicable, in the nineteenth century, would be a scandal upon mankind. And just in proportion as these "abuses" cease to have the sanction of law, will the institution of Slavery cease to exist. The African, whatever may then be his condition, will no longer be *the slave* over whose wrongs and sorrows the world throbs at times fiercely indignant, and at times painfully sad, while with outstretched arms, he sends forth the piteous cry, "Am I not a man and a brother?"

In pressing forward to this result, the inquiry is often presented, to what extent, if any, shall compensation be allowed to the slave-masters? Clearly, if the point be determined by *absolute justice*, not the masters but the slaves will be entitled to compensation; for it is the slaves, who, throughout weary generations, have been deprived of their toil, and all its fruits which went to enrich their masters. Besides, it seems hardly reasonable to pay for the relinquishment of those disgusting "abuses," which, in their aggregation, constitute the bundle of Slavery. Pray, Sir, by what tariff, price current, or principle of equation, shall their several values be estimated? What sum shall be counted out as the proper price for the abandonment of that pretension — more indecent than the *jus primæ noctis* of the feudal age — which leaves woman, whether in the arms of master or slave, always a concubine? What bribe shall be proffered for the restoration of God-given parental rights? What money shall be paid for taking off the padlock by which souls are fastened down in darkness? How much for a quit-claim to labor

now meanly exacted by the strong from the weak? And what compensation shall be awarded for the surrender of that egregious assumption, condemned by reason and abhorred by piety, which changes a man into a thing? I put these questions without undertaking to pass upon them. Shrinking instinctively from any recognition of *rights founded on wrongs*, I find myself shrinking also from any austere verdict, which shall deny the means necessary to the great consummation we seek. Our fathers, under Washington, did not hesitate by Act of Congress, to appropriate largely for the ransom of white fellow-citizens enslaved by Algerine corsairs; and, following this example, I am disposed to consider the question of compensation as one of expediency, to be determined by the exigency of the hour and the constitutional powers of the Government; though such is my desire to see the foul fiend of Slavery in flight, that I could not hesitate to build even a bridge of gold, if necessary, to promote his escape.

The *Practicability* of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise has been constantly questioned, often so superficially, as to be answered at once. I shall not take time to consider the allegation, founded on considerations of economy, which audaciously assumes that Slave Labor is more advantageous than Free Labor—that Slavery is more profitable than Freedom; for this is all exploded by the official tables of the census; nor that other futile argument, that the slaves are not prepared for Freedom, and, therefore, should not be precipitated into this condition,—for that is no better than the ancient Greek folly, where the anxious mother would not allow her son to go into the water until he had first learned to swim. But as against the Necessity of the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, there were two chief objections, so, also, against its Practicability are there two: the first, founded on its alleged danger to the master, and the second, on its alleged damage to the slave himself.

1. The first objection, founded on the alleged *danger to the master*, most generally takes the extravagant form, that the slave, if released from his present condition, would cut his master's throat. Here is a blatant paradox, which can pass for reason only among those who have lost their reason. With

an absurdity which finds no parallel except in the defences of Slavery, it assumes that the African, when treated justly, will show a vindictiveness which he does not exhibit when treated unjustly; that when elevated by the blessings of Freedom, he will develop an appetite for blood which he never manifested when crushed by the curse of bondage. At present, the slave sees his wife ravished from his arms—sees his infant swept away to the auction block—sees the heavenly gate of knowledge shut upon him—sees his industry and all its fruits unjustly snatched by another—sees himself and offspring doomed to a servitude from which there is no redemption; and still his master sleeps secure. Will the master sleep less secure, when the slave no longer smarts under these revolting atrocities? I will not trifle with your intelligence, or with the quick-passing hour, by arguing this question.

But there is a lofty example, brightening the historic page, by which the seal of experience is affixed to the conclusions of reason; and you would hardly pardon me if I failed to adduce it. By virtue of a single Act of Parliament, the slaves of the British West Indies were changed at once to freedmen; and this great transition was accomplished absolutely without personal danger of any kind to the master. And yet the chance of danger there was greater far than among us. In our broad country, the slaves are overshadowed by a more than six-fold white population. Only in two States,—South Carolina and Mississippi,—do the slaves outnumber the whites, and there but slightly, while in the entire Slave States, the whites outnumber the slaves by many millions. But it was otherwise in the British West Indies, where the whites were overshadowed by a more than six-fold slave population. The slaves were 800,000, while the whites numbered only 131,000, distributed in different proportions on the different islands. And this disproportion has since increased rather than diminished, always without danger to the whites. In Jamaica, the largest of these possessions, there are now upwards of 400,000 Africans, and only 37,000 whites; in Barbadoes, the next largest possession, there are 120,000 Africans, and only 15,000 whites; in St. Lucia, 19,500 Africans, and only 600 whites; in Tobago, 14,000 Africans, and only 600 whites; in Montserrat, 6000

Africans, and only 150 whites; and in the Grenadines, upwards of 6000 Africans, and less than 50 whites. And yet in all these places, the authorities attest the good behavior of the Africans. Sir Lionel Smith, the Governor of Jamaica, in his speech to the Assembly, declared that their conduct "proves how well they deserved the boon of Freedom." Another Governor of another island dwells on the "peculiarly rare instances of the commission of grave or sanguinary crimes among the emancipated portion of these islands;" and the Queen of England, in a speech from the throne, has announced that the complete and final emancipation of the Africans had "taken place without any disturbance of public order and tranquillity." In this example I hail new confirmation of the rule that the highest safety is in doing right; and thus do I dismiss the objection founded on the alleged danger to the master.

2. And I am now brought to the second objection, founded on the alleged *damage to the slave*. It is common among the partisans of Slavery, to assert that our Enterprise has actually retarded the very cause it seeks to promote; and this paradoxical accusation, which might naturally show itself among the rank weeds of the South, is cherished here on our Northern soil, by those who anxiously look for any fig-leaf with which to cover their indifference or tergiversation.

This peculiar form of complaint is an old device, which has been instinctively employed on other occasions until it has ceased to be even plausible. Thus, throughout all times, has every good cause been encountered. The Saviour was nailed to the cross with a crown of thorns on his head, as a disturber of that peace on earth which he came to declare. The disciples, while preaching the Gospel of forgiveness and good will, were stoned as preachers of sedition and discord. The reformers, who sought to establish a higher piety and faith, were burnt at the stake as blasphemers and infidels. Patriots, in all ages, who have striven for their country's good, have been doomed to the scaffold or to exile, even as their country's enemies. And those brave Englishmen, who, at home, under the lead of Edmund Burke, even against their own country, espoused the cause of our fathers, shared the same illogical

impeachment which was touched to the quick by that orator statesman, when, after exposing its essential vice “in attributing the ill-effect of ill-judged conduct to the arguments used to dissuade us from it,” he denounced it as “very absurd, but very common in modern practice, and very wicked.” Ay, Sir, it is common in modern practice. In England, it has vainly renewed itself with special frequency against the Bible Societies; against the friends of education; against the patrons of vaccination; against the partisans of peace, all of whom have been openly arraigned as provoking and increasing the very evils, whether of infidelity, idleness, disease, or war, which they benignly sought to check. And to bring an instance which is precisely applicable to our own, Wilberforce, when conducting the Anti-Slavery Enterprise of England, first against the slave-trade and then against Slavery itself, was told that those efforts, by which his name is now consecrated forevermore, tended to increase the hardships of the slave, even to the extent of rivetting anew his chains. Such are the precedents for the imputation to which our Enterprise is exposed; and such, also, are the precedents by which I exhibit the fallacy of the imputation.

Sir, I do not doubt that the Enterprise has produced heat and irritation, amounting often to inflammation, among slave-masters, which, to superficial minds, may seem inconsistent with success; but which the careful observer will recognize at once as the natural and not unhealthy effort of a diseased body, to purge itself of existing impurities; and just in proportion to the malignity of the concealed poison, will be the extent of inflammation. A distemper like Slavery cannot be ejected like a splinter. It is, perhaps, too much to expect that men thus tortured should reason calmly—that patients thus suffering should comprehend the true nature of their case and kindly acknowledge the beneficent work; but not on this account can it be suspended.

In the face of this complaint, I assert that the Anti-Slavery Enterprise has already accomplished incalculable good. Even now it touches the national heart as it never before was touched, sweeping its strings with a might to draw forth emotions such as no political struggle has ever evoked. It

moves the young, the middle-aged, and the old. It enters the family circle, and mingles with the flame of the household hearth. It reaches the souls of mothers, wives, sisters, and daughters, filling all with a new aspiration for justice on earth, and awakening not merely a sentiment against Slavery, such as prevailed with our fathers, but a deep, undying conviction of its wrong, and a determination to leave no effort unattempted for its removal. With the sympathies of all Christendom as allies, it has already encompassed the slave-masters by a *moral blockade*, invisible to the eye, but more potent than navies, from which there can be no escape except in final capitulation. Thus it has created the irresistible influence which itself constitutes the beginning of success. Already there are signs of change. In common speech, as well as in writing, among slave-masters, the bondman is no longer called a *slave*, but a *servant*, — thus, by a soft substitution, concealing and condemning the true relation. Even newspapers in the land of bondage blush with indignation at the hunt of men by bloodhounds, thus protesting against an unquestionable incident of Slavery. Other signs are found in the added comfort of the slave; in the enlarged attention to his wants; in the experiments now beginning, by which the slave is enabled to share in the profits of his labor, and thus finally secure his freedom; and, above all, in the consciousness among slave-masters themselves, that they dwell now as never before under the keen observation of an ever-wakeful Public Opinion, quickened by an ever-wakeful Public Press. Nor is this all. Only lately propositions have been introduced into the legislatures of different States, and countenanced by governors, to mitigate the existing law of Slavery; and, almost while speaking, I have received the drafts of two different memorials, — one addressed to the legislature of Virginia, and the other to that of North Carolina, — asking for the slave three things, which it will be monstrous to refuse, but which, if conceded, will take from Slavery its existing character; — I mean, first, the protection of the marriage relation; secondly, the protection of the parental relation; and, thirdly, the privilege of knowledge. Grant these, and the girdled Upas tree soon must die. Sir, amidst these tokens of present success, and

the auguries of the future, I am not disturbed by any complaints of seeming damage. "Though it consume our own dwelling who does not venerate fire, without which human life can hardly exist on earth," says the Hindoo proverb; and the time is even now at hand when the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, which is the very fire of Freedom, with all its incidental excesses or excitements, will be hailed with a similar regard.

III. And now, in the *third* place, the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, which I have shown to be at once necessary and practicable, is commended by its inherent DIGNITY. Here the reasons are obvious and unanswerable.

Its object is benevolent; nor is there, in the dreary annals of the Past, a single enterprise which stands forth more clearly and indisputably entitled to this character. With unsurpassed and touching magnanimity, it seeks to benefit the lowly whom your eyes have not seen, and who are ignorant even of your labors, while it demands and receives a self-sacrifice calculated to ennable an enterprise of even questionable merit. Its true rank is among works properly called *philanthropic*—the title of highest honor on earth. "I take goodness in this sense," says Lord Bacon in his Essays, "*the affecting of the weal of men*, which is what the Grecians call *Philanthropeia*—of all virtues and dignities of the mind the greatest, being the character of the Deity; and without it, man is a busy, mischievous, wretched thing, no better than a kind of vermin." Lord Bacon was right, and, perhaps, unconsciously followed a higher authority; for, when Moses asked the Lord to show unto him His glory, the Lord said, "I will make all my goodness to pass before thee." Ah! Sir, Peace has trophies fairer and more perennial than any snatched from fields of blood, but among all these, the fairest and most perennial are the trophies of beneficence. Scholarship, literature, jurisprudence, art, may wear their well-deserved honors; but an Enterprise of goodness deserves, and will yet receive, a higher palm than these.

In other aspects its dignity is apparent. It concerns the cause of Human Freedom, which, from the earliest days, has been the darling of history. By all the memories of the Past;

by the stories of childhood and the studies of youth; by every example of magnanimous virtue; by every aspiration for the good and true; by the fame of the martyrs swelling through all time; by the renown of patriots whose lives are landmarks of progress; by the praise lavished upon our fathers, you are summoned to this work. Unless Freedom be an illusion, and benevolence an error, you cannot resist the appeal. But our cause is nobler even than that of our fathers, inasmuch as it is more exalted to struggle for the Freedom of *others* than for our *own*.

Its practical importance at this moment gives to it an additional eminence. Whether measured by the number of beings it seeks to benefit; by the magnitude of the wrongs it hopes to relieve; by the difficulties with which it is beset; by the political relations which it affects; or by the ability and character it has enlisted, the cause of the slave now assumes proportions of grandeur which dwarf all other interests in our broad country. In its presence the machinations of politicians, the aspirations of office-seekers and the subterfuges of party, all sink below even their ordinary insignificance. For myself, Sir, I can see little else at this time among us which can tempt out on to the exposed steeps of public life an honest man, who wishes, by something that he does, to leave the world better than he found it. I can see little else which can afford any of those satisfactions which an honest man should covet. Nor is there any cause which so surely promises final success;

“ Oh ! a fair cause stands firm and will abide ;  
Legions of angels fight upon its side ! ”

It is written that in the last days there shall be scoffers, and even this Enterprise, thus philanthropic, has not escaped their aspersions. And as the objections to its Necessity were two-fold, and the objections to its Practicability two-fold, so, also, are the aspersions two-fold;—first in the form of hard words, and secondly, by personal disparagement of those who are engaged in it.

1. The *hard words* are manifold as the passions and prejudices of men; but they generally end in the imputation of “fanaticism.” In such a cause, I am willing to be called

“fanatic,” or what you will; I care not for aspersions, nor shall I shrink before hard words, either here or elsewhere. I have learned from that great Englishman, Oliver Cromwell, that no man can be trusted “who is afraid of a paper pellet;” and I am too familiar with history not to know, that every movement for reform, in Church or State, every endeavor for Human Liberty or Human Rights, has been thus assailed. I do not forget with what facility and frequency hard words have been employed — how that grandest character of many generations, the precursor of our own Washington, without whose example our Republic might have failed — the great William, Prince of Orange, the founder of the Dutch Republic, the United States of Holland — I do not forget how he was publicly branded as “a perjuror and a pest of society;” and, not to dwell on general instances, how the enterprise for the abolition of the slave-trade was characterized on the floor of Parliament by one eminent speaker, as “mischievous,” and by another as “visionary and delusive;” and how the exalted characters which it had enlisted were arraigned by still another eminent speaker — none other than that Tarleton, so conspicuous as the commander of the British horse in the southern campaigns of our Revolution, but more conspicuous in politics at home, — “as a junto of sectaries, sophists, enthusiasts, and fanatics;” and also were again arraigned by no less a person than a prince of the blood, the Duke of Clarence, afterwards William IV. of England, as “either fanatics or hypocrites,” in one of which classes he openly placed William Wilberforce. But impartial history, with immortal pen, has redressed these impassioned judgments; and the same impartial history will yet rejudge the impassioned judgments of this hour.

2. Hard words have been followed by *personal disparagement*, and the sneer is often launched that our Enterprise lacks the authority of names eminent in Church and State. If this be so, the more is the pity on their account; for our cause is needed to them more than they are needed to our cause. But alas! it is only according to the example of history that it should be so. It is not the eminent in Church and State, the rich and powerful, the favorites of fortune and of place, who most promptly welcome Truth, when she heralds change in

the existing order of things. It is others in poorer condition who throw open their hospitable hearts to the unattended stranger. Nay, more; it is not the dwellers amidst the glare of the world, but the humble and lowly, who most clearly discern new duties,—as the watchers, placed in the depths of a well, may observe the stars which are obscured to those who live in the effulgence of noon. Placed below the egotism and prejudice of self-interest, or of a class—below the cares and temptations of wealth or power—in the obscurity of common life, they discern the new signal, and surrender themselves unreservedly to its guidance. The Saviour knew this. He did not call upon the Priest, or Levite, or Pharisee, to follow him; but upon the humble fisherman by the sea of Galilee.

And now, Sir, I present to you the Anti-Slavery Enterprise vindicated in Necessity, Practicability, and Dignity, against all objections. If there be any objection which I have not answered, it is because I am not aware of its existence. It remains that I should give a practical conclusion to this whole matter, by showing, though in glimpses only, your **SPECIAL DUTIES AS FREEMEN OF THE NORTH.** And, thank God! at last there is a North.

Mr. President, it is not uncommon to hear persons among us at the North, confess the wrong of Slavery, and then, folding their hands in absolute listlessness, ejaculate, “What can we do about it?” Such men we encounter daily. You all know them. Among them are men in every department of human activity—who perpetually buy, build, and plan—who shrink from no labor—who are daunted by no peril of commercial adventure, by no hardihood of industrial enterprise—who, reaching in their undertakings across oceans and continents, would undertake “to put ‘a girdle about the earth in forty seconds;’” and yet, disheartened, they can join in no effort against Slavery. Others there are, especially among the youthful and enthusiastic, who vainly sigh because they were not born in the age of chivalry, or at least in the days of the revolution, not thinking that in this Enterprise, there is an opportunity of lofty endeavor such as no Paladin of chivalry,

or chief of the revolution enjoyed. Others there are, who freely bestow their means and time upon the distant inaccessible heathen of another hemisphere, in the islands of the sea; and yet they can do nothing to mitigate our grander heathenism here at home. While confessing that it ought to disappear from the earth, they forego, renounce, and abandon all exertion against it. Others there are still, (such is human inconsistency!) who plant the tree in whose full-grown shade they can never expect to sit—who hopefully drop the acorn in the earth, trusting that the oak which it sends upward to the skies will shelter their children beneath its shade; but they will do nothing to plant or nurture the great tree of Liberty, that it may cover with its arms unborn generations of men.

Others still there are, particularly in the large cities, who content themselves by occasional contributions to the redemption of a slave. To this object they give out of ample riches, and thus seek to silence the monitions of conscience. Now, I would not discountenance any form of activity by which Human Freedom, even in a single case, may be secured. But I desire to say, that such an act—too often accompanied by a pharisaical pretension, in strange contrast with the petty performance—cannot be considered an essential aid to the Anti-Slavery Enterprise. Not in this way can any impression be made on an evil so vast as Slavery—as you will clearly see by an illustration which I shall give. The god Thor, of Scandinavian mythology,—whose strength surpassed that of Hercules,—was once challenged to drain a simple cup dry. He applied it to his lips, and with superhuman capacity drank, but the water did not recede even from the rim, and at last the god abandoned the effort. The failure of even his extraordinary strength was explained, when he learned that the simple cup had communicated, by an invisible connection, with the whole vast ocean behind, out of which it was perpetually supplied, and which remained absolutely unaffected by the effort. And just so will these occasions of charity, though encountered by the largest private means, be constantly renewed, for they communicate with the whole vast Black Sea of Slavery behind, out of which they are perpetually supplied, and which remains absolutely unaffected by the

effort. Sir, private means may cope with individual necessities, but they are powerless to redress the evils of a wicked institution. Charity is limited and local; the evils of Slavery are infinite and every where. Besides, a wrong organized and upheld by law, can be removed only through a change of the law. Not, then, by an occasional contribution to ransom a slave can your duty be done in this great cause; but only by earnest, constant, valiant efforts against the institution—against the law—which makes slaves.

I am not insensible to the difficulties of this work. Full well I know the power of Slavery. Full well I know all its various intrenchments in the church, the polities and the prejudices of the country. Full well I know the sensitive interests of property, amounting to many hundred millions of dollars, which are said to be at stake. But these things can furnish no motive or apology for indifference, or for any folding of the hands. Surely the wrong is not less wrong because it is gigantic; the evil is not less evil because it is immeasurable; nor can the duty of perpetual warfare, with wrong, or evil, be in this instance suspended. Nay, because Slavery is powerful—because the Enterprise is difficult—therefore is the duty of all more exigent. The well-tempered soul does not yield to difficulties, but presses *onward forever* with increased resolution.

And here the question occurs, which is so often pressed in argument or in taunt, *What have we at the North to do with Slavery?* In answer, I might content myself by saying that as members of the human family, bound together by the cords of a common manhood, there is no human wrong to which we can justly be insensible, nor is there any human sorrow which we should not seek to relieve; but I prefer to say, on this occasion, that, as citizens of the United States, anxious for the good name, the repose, and the prosperity of the Republic—that it may be a blessing and not a curse to mankind—there is nothing among all its diversified interests, under the National Constitution, with which, at this moment, we have so much to do; nor is there any thing with regard to which our duties are so irresistibly clear. I do not dwell on the scandal of Slavery in the national capital—of Slavery in the

national territories — of the coast-wise slave-trade on the high seas beneath the national flag, — all of which are outside of State limits, and within the exclusive jurisdiction of Congress, where you and I, Sir, and every freeman of the North, are compelled to share the responsibility and help to bind the chain. To dislodge Slavery from these usurped footholds under the Constitution, and thus at once to relieve ourselves from a grievous responsibility, and to begin the great work of emancipation, were an object worthy of an exalted ambition. But before even this can be commenced, there is a great work, more than any other important and urgent, which must be consummated in the domain of national politics, and also here at home in the Free States. The National Government itself must be emancipated, so that it shall no longer wear the yoke of servitude; and Slavery in all its pretensions must be dislodged from its usurped foothold, in the Free States themselves, thus relieving ourselves from a grievous responsibility at our own doors, and emancipating the North. Emancipation, even within the national jurisdiction, can be achieved only through the emancipation of the Free States, accompanied by the complete emancipation of the National Government. Ay, Sir, emancipation at the South can be reached only through the emancipation of the North. And this is my answer to the interrogatory, What have we at the North to do with Slavery?

But the answer may be made yet more irresistible, while, with mingled sorrow and shame, I portray the tyrannical power, which holds us in thraldom. Notwithstanding all its excess of numbers, wealth and intelligence, the North is now the vassal of an OLIGARCHY, whose single inspiration comes from Slavery. According to the official tables of our recent census, the *slave-masters* — men, women, and children all told — are only THREE HUNDRED AND FORTY SEVEN THOUSAND; and yet this small company, now dominates over the Republic, determines its national policy, disposes of its offices, and sways all to its absolute will. With a watchfulness that never sleeps, and an activity that never tires — with as many eyes as Argus, and as many arms as Briareus — the SLAVE OLIGARCHY asserts its perpetual

and insatiate masterdom; now seizing a broad territory once covered by a time-honored ordinance of Freedom; now threatening to wrest Cuba from Spain by violent war, or hardly less violent purchase; now hankering for another slice of Mexico, merely to find new scope for Slavery; now proposing once more to open the hideous, heaven-defying Slave-trade, and thus to replenish its shambles with human flesh; and now, by the lips of an eminent Senator, asserting an audacious claim to the whole group of the West Indies, whether held by Holland, Spain, France, or England, as "our Southern Islands," while it assails the independence of Hayti, and stretches its treacherous ambition even to the distant valley of the Amazon.

In maintaining its power, the Slave Oligarchy has applied a new test for office, very different from that of Jefferson; "Is he honest? is he capable? is he faithful to the Constitution?" These things are all forgotten now in the controlling question, "Is he faithful to Slavery?" With arrogant ostracism it excludes from every national office all who cannot respond to this test. So complete and irrational has this tyranny become, that, at this moment, while I now speak, could Washington, Jefferson, or Franklin, once more descend from their spheres above, to mingle in our affairs and bless us with their wisdom, not one of them, with his recorded, *unretracted* opinions on Slavery, could receive a nomination for the Presidency from a National Convention of either of the late great political parties; nor, stranger still, could either of these sainted patriots, whose names alone open a perpetual fountain of gratitude in all your hearts, be confirmed by the Senate of the United States for any political function whatever under the National Government—not even for the office of postmaster. What I now say, amidst your natural astonishment, I have more than once uttered from my seat in the Senate, and no man there has made answer, for no man, who has sat in its secret sessions and there learned the test which is practically applied, could make answer; and I ask you to accept this statement as my testimony derived from the experience which has been my lot. Yes, fellow-citizens, had this test prevailed in the earlier days, Washington,—first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of

his countrymen,—could not have been created Generalissimo of the American forces; Jefferson could not have taken his place on the Committee to draft the Declaration of Independence; and Franklin could not have gone forth to France, with the commission of the infant Republic, to secure the invaluable alliance of that ancient kingdom.

And this giant strength is used with a giant heartlessness. By a cruel enactment, which has no source in the Constitution—which defies justice—which tramples on humanity—and which rebels against God, the Free States are made the hunting-ground for slaves, and you, and I, and all good citizens, are summoned to join in the loathsome and abhorred work. Your hearts and judgments, swift to feel and to condemn, will not require me to expose here the abomination of the Fugitive Slave Bill or its utter unconstitutionality. Elsewhere I have done this, and never been answered. Nor will you expect that an enactment, so entirely devoid of all just sanction, should be called by the sacred name of *law*. History still repeats the language in which our fathers persevered, when they denounced the last emanation of British tyranny which heralded the revolution, as the Boston Port *Bill*, and I am content with this precedent. I have said that if any man finds in the Gospel any support of Slavery, it is because Slavery is already in himself; so do I now say, if any man finds in the Constitution of our country any support of the Fugitive Slave Bill, it is because that bill is already in himself. One of our ancient masters—Aristotle, I think—tells us that every man has a beast in his bosom; but the Northern citizen, who has the Fugitive Slave Bill there, has worse than a beast—a devil! And yet in this bill—more even than in the ostracism at which you rebel—does the Slave Oligarchy stand confessed; heartless, grasping, tyrannical; careless of humanity, right, or the Constitution; wanting that foundation of justice which is the essential base of every civilized community; stuck together only by confederacy in spoliation; and constituting in itself a *magnum latrocinium*; while it degrades the Free States to the condition of a slave plantation, under the lash of a vulgar, despised and revolting overseer.

Surely, fellow citizens, without hesitation or postponement

you will insist that this Oligarchy shall be overthrown; and here is the foremost among the special duties of the North, now required for the honor of the republic, for our own defence, and in obedience to God. Urging this comprehensible duty, I ought to have hours rather than minutes before me; but, in a few words, you shall see its comprehensive importance. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the wickedness of the Fugitive Slave Bill will be expelled from the statute book. Prostrate the slave Oligarchy—and Slavery will cease at once in the national capital. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and liberty will become the universal law of all the national territories. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the Slave-trade will no longer skulk along our coasts, beneath the national flag. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the national government will be at length divorced from Slavery. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the national policy will be exchanged from Slavery to Freedom. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the North will no longer be the vassal of the South. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the North will be admitted to its just share in the trusts and honors of the Republic. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and you will possess the master-key to unlock the whole house of Slavery. Prostrate the Slave Oligarchy—and the gates of emancipation will be open at the South.

But, without waiting for this consummation, there is another special duty to be done here at home, on our own soil, which must be made free in reality, as in name. And here I shall speak frankly, though not without a proper sense of the responsibility of my words. I know that I cannot address you entirely as a private citizen; but I shall say nothing here, which I have not said elsewhere, and which, I shall not be proud to vindicate everywhere. “A lie,” it has been declared, “should be trampled out and extinguished forever,” and surely you will do nothing less with a tyrannical and wicked enactment. The Fugitive Slave Bill, while it continues unrepealed, must be made a dead letter; not by violence; not by any unconstitutional activity or intervention; not even by hasty conflict between jurisdictions; but by an aroused Public Opinion, which, in its irresistible might, shall blast with contempt, indignation and abhorrence, all who consent to be its agents.

Thus did our fathers blast all who became the agents of the Stamp Act; and surely their motive was small compared with ours. The Slave Hunter who drags his victim from Africa is loathed as a monster; but I defy any acuteness of reason to indicate the moral difference between his act and that of the Slave Hunter who drags his victim from our Northern free soil. A few puny persons, calling themselves the Congress of the United States, with the titles of Representatives and Senators, cannot turn wrong into right—cannot change a man into a thing—cannot reverse the irreversible law of God—cannot make him wicked who hunts a slave on the burning sands of Congo or Guinea, and make him virtuous who hunts a slave in the colder streets of Boston or New York. Nor can any acuteness of reason distinguish between the bill of sale from the kidnapper, by which the unhappy African was originally transferred in Congo or Guinea, and the certificate of the Commissioneer, by which, when once again in Freedom, he was reduced anew to bondage. The acts are kindred, and should share a kindred condemnation.

One man's virtue becomes a standard of excellence for all; and there is now in Boston, a simple citizen, whose example may be a lesson to Commissioners, Marshals, Magistrates; while it fills all with the beauty of a generous act. I refer to Mr. Hayes, who resigned his place in the city police rather than take any part in the pack of the Slave Hunter. He is now the door-keeper of the public edifice which has been honored this winter by the triumphant lectures on slavery. Better be a door-keeper in the house of the Lord than a dweller in the tents of the ungodly. For myself, let me say, that I can imagine no office, no salary, no consideration, which I would not gladly forego, rather than become in any way an agent for the enslavement of my brother-man. Where, for me, would be comfort or solace after such a work! In dreams and in waking hours, in solitude and in the street, in the study of the open book and in conversation with the world,—wherever I turned, there my victim would stare me in the face; while from the distant rice-fields and sugar plantations of the South, his cries beneath the vindictive lash, his moans at the thought of liberty once his, now, alas! ravished away,

would pursue me, repeating the tale of his fearful doom, and sounding—forever sounding—in my ears, “Thou art the man.” Mr. President, may no such terrible voice fall on your soul or mine!

Yes, Sir, here our duty is plain and paramount. While the Slave Oligarchy, through its unrepealed Slave Bill, undertakes to enslave our free soil, we can only turn for protection to a Public Opinion, worthy of a humane, just and religious people, which shall keep perpetual guard over the liberties of all within our borders; nay more, which, like the flaming sword of the cherubim at the gates of Paradise, turning on every side, shall prevent any Slave Hunter from ever setting foot on our sacred soil. Elsewhere he may pursue his human prey; he may employ his congenial blood-hounds, and exult in his successful game. But into these domains of Freedom he must not come. And this Public Opinion, with Freedom as its watch-word, must proclaim not only the overthrow of the Slave Bill, but also the overthrow of the Slave Oligarchy behind,—the two pressing duties of the North, essential to our own emancipation; and believe me, Sir, while they remain undone, nothing is done.

Mr. President, far already have I trespassed upon your generous patience; but there are other things which still press for utterance. Something would I say of the arguments by which our Enterprise is commended; something also of the appeal it makes to men of every condition; and something also of union, as a vital necessity among all who love Freedom.

I know not if our work can be soon accomplished. I know not, Sir, if you or I can live to see in our Republic the vows of the Fathers at length fulfilled, as the last fetter falls from the limbs of the last slave. But one thing I do know, beyond all doubt or question, that this Enterprise must go on—that in its irresistible current, it will sweep schools, colleges, churches, the intelligence, the conscience, and the religious aspirations of the land, while all, who stand in its way or speak evil of it, are laying up for their children, if not for

themselves, days of sorrow and shame. Better to strive in this cause, even unsuccessfully, than never to strive at all.

There is no weapon in the celestial armory of truth; there is no sweet influence from the skies; there is no generous word that ever dropped from human lips, which may not be employed. Ours, too, is the argument alike of the Conservative and the Reformer, for our cause stands on the truest conservatism and the truest reform. It seeks the conservation of Freedom itself and of its kindred historic principles; it seeks also the reform of Slavery and of kindred tyranny by which it is upheld. Religion, morals, justice, economy, the Constitution, may each and all be invoked; and one person is touched by one argument, while another person is touched by another. You do not forget how Christopher Columbus won Isabella of Spain, to his enterprise of discovery. He first presented to her the temptation of extending her dominions; but she hearkened not. He next promised to her the dazzling wealth of the Indies; and still she hearkened not. But when at last was pictured to her pious imagination the poor heathen with souls to be saved, then the youthful Queen poured her royal jewels into the lap of the Genoese adventurer, and at her expense, that small fleet was sent forth, which gave to Spain and to mankind a New World.

As in this Enterprise, there is a place for every argument, so also is there a place for every man. Even as on the broad shield of Achilles, sculptured by divine art, was wrought every form of human activity; so in this cause, which is the very shield of Freedom, whatever man can do by deed or speech, may find its place. One may act in one way, and another in another way; but all must act. Providence is felt through individuals; the dropping of water wears away the rock; and no man can be so humble or poor as to be excused from this work, while to all the happy in genius, fortune or fame, it makes a special appeal. Here is room for the strength of Luther, and the sweetness of Melancthon; for the wisdom of age, and the ardor of youth; for the judgment of the statesman, and the eloquence of the orator; for the grace of the scholar, and the aspiration of the poet; for the learning of the professor, and the skill of the lawyer; for the exhortation of the preacher, and the per-

suasion of the press; for the various energy of the citizen, and the abounding sympathy of woman.

And still one thing more is needed, without which Liberty-loving men, and even their arguments, will fail in power—even as without charity all graces of knowledge, speech, and faith are said to profit nothing. I mean that *Unity of Spirit*—in itself a fountain of strength—which, filling the people of the North, shall make them tread under foot past antipathies, decayed dissensions, and those irritating names which now exist only as the tattered ensigns of ancient strife. It is right to be taught by the enemy; and with their example before us and their power brandished in our very faces, we cannot hesitate. With them Slavery is made the main-spring of political life, and the absorbing centre of political activity; with them all differences are swallowed up by this *one idea*, as all other rods were swallowed up by the rod of Aaron; with them all unite to keep the national government under the control of slave-masters; and surely we should not do less for Freedom than they do for Slavery. *We too must be united.* Among us at last mutual criticism, crimination, and feud, must give place to mutual sympathy, trust and alliance. Face to face against the **SLAVE OLIGARCHY** must be rallied the **UNITED MASSES** of the North, in compact political association—planted on the everlasting base of justice—knit together by the instincts of a common danger, and by the holy sympathies of humanity—enkindled by a love of Freedom, not only for themselves, but for others—determined to enfranchise the national government from degrading thraldom—and constituting the **BACK-BONE PARTY**, powerful in numbers, wealth, and intelligence, but more powerful still in an inspiring cause. Let this be done, and victory will be ours.





5/10  
THE LANDMARK OF FREEDOM.

SPEECH

OF

HON. CHARLES SUMNER,

AGAINST THE REPEAL

OF THE

MISSOURI PROHIBITION OF SLAVERY NORTH OF 36° 30'.

IN THE SENATE, FEBRUARY 21, 1854.

*"Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's Landmark. And all the people shall say, AMEN."*

DEUT., ch. xxvii, v. 27.

The Senate having under consideration the bill to establish Territorial Governments in Nebraska and Kansas—

Mr. SUMNER said :

Mr. President: I approach this discussion with awe. The mighty question, with untold issues, which it involves, oppresses me. Like a portentous cloud, surcharged with irresistible storm and ruin, it seems to fill the whole heavens, making me painfully conscious how unequal I am to the occasion—how unequal, also, is all that I can say, to all that I feel.

In delivering my sentiments here to-day, I shall speak frankly—according to my convictions, without concealment or reserve. But if anything fell from the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLAS,] in opening this discussion, which might seem to challenge a personal contest, I desire to say that I shall not enter upon it. Let not a word or a tone pass my lips, to direct attention, for a moment, from the transcendent theme, by the side of which Senators and Presidents are but dwarfs. I would not forget those amenities which belong to this place, and are so well calculated to temper the antagonism of debate; nor can I cease to remember and to feel, that, amidst all diversities of opinion, we are the representatives of thirty-one sister republics, knit together by indissoluble tie, and constituting that Plural Unit, which we all embrace by the endearing name of country.

The question presented for your consideration is not surpassed in grandeur by any which has occurred in our national history since the Declaration of Independence. In every aspect it assumes gigantic proportions, whether we simply consider the extent of territory it concerns, or the public faith, and national policy which it assails, or that higher question—that *Question of Questions*, as far above others as Liberty is above the common things of life—which it opens anew for judgment.

It concerns an immense region, larger than the original thirteen States, vieing in extent with all the existing free States—stretching over prairie, field, and forest—interlaced by silver streams, skirted by protecting mountains, and constituting the heart of the North American continent—only a little smaller, let me add, than three great European countries combined—Italy, Spain, and France—each of which, in succession, has dominated over the globe. This territory has already been likened, on this floor, to the Garden of God. The similitude is found, not merely in its present pure and virgin character, but in its actual geographical situation, occupying central spaces on this hemisphere, which, in their general relations, may well compare with that early Asiatic home. We are told that,

Southward through Eden went a river large; so here a stream flows southward which is larger than the Euphrates. And here,

too, amidst all the smiling products of nature, lavished by the hand of God, is the lofty tree of Liberty, planted by our fathers which, without exaggeration, or even imagination, may be likened to

the tree of life,  
High eminent, blooming ambrosial fruit  
Of vegetable gold.

It is with regard to this territory, that you are now called to exercise the grandest function of the lawgiver, by establishing those rules of polity which will determine its future character. As the twig is bent the tree inclines; and the influences impressed upon the early days of an empire, like those upon a child, are of inconceivable importance to its future weal or woe. The bill now before us, proposes to organize and equip two new territorial establishments, with governors, secretaries, legislative councils, legislators, judges, marshals, and the whole machinery of civil society. Such a measure, at any time, would deserve the most careful attention. But, at the present moment, it justly excites a peculiar interest, from the effort made—on pretences unsustained by facts—in violation of solemn covenant, and of the early principles of our fathers—to open this immense region to slavery.

According to existing law, this territory is now guarded against slavery by a positive prohibition, embodied in the act of Congress, approved March 6th, 1820, preparatory to the admission of Missouri into the Union, as a sister State, and in the following explicit words :

"SEC. 8. *Be it further enacted*, That in all that territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana, which lies north 36° 30' of north latitude, not included within the limits of the State contemplated by this act, SLAVERY AND INVOLUNTARY SERVITUDE, otherwise than as the punishment of crimes, SHALL BE, AND IS HEREBY, FOREVER PROHIBITED."

It is now proposed to set aside this prohibition; but there seems to be a singular indecision as to the way in which the deed shall be done. From the time of its first introduction, in the report of the Committee on Territories, the proposition has assumed different shapes; and it promises to assume as many as Proteus; now, one thing in form, and now, another; now, like a river, and then like flame; but, in every form and shape, identical in substance; with but one end and aim—its be-all and

end-all—the overthrow of the Prohibition of Slavery. At first, it proposed simply to declare, that the States formed out of this territory should be admitted into the Union, "with or without slavery," and did not directly assume to touch this Prohibition. For some reason this was not satisfactory, and then it was precipitately proposed to declare, that the prohibition in the Missouri act "was superseded by the principles of the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, and is hereby declared inoperative." But this would not do; and it is now proposed to declare, that the Prohibition, "being inconsistent with the principles of non-intervention, by Congress, with slavery in the States and Territories, as recognised by the legislation of 1850, commonly called the Compromise Measures, is hereby declared inoperative and void."

All this is to be done on pretences founded upon the slavery enactments of 1850, thus seeking, with mingled audacity and cunning, "by indirection to find direction out." Now, sir, I am not here to speak in behalf of those measures, or to lean in any way upon their support. Relating to different subject-matters, contained in different acts, which prevailed successively, at different times, and by different votes—some persons voting for one measure, and some voting for another, and very few voting for all—they cannot be regarded as a *unit*, embodying conditions of compact, or compromise, if you please, adopted equally by all parties, and therefore obligatory on all parties. But since this broken series of measures has been adduced as an apology for the proposition now before us, I desire to say, that, such as they are, they cannot, by any effort of interpretation, by any distorting wand of power, by any perverse alchemy, be transmuted into a repeal of that original Prohibition of Slavery.

On this head there are several points to which I would merely call attention, and then pass on. *First*: The slavery enactments of 1850 did not pretend, in terms, to touch, much less to change, the condition of the Louisiana Territory, which was already fixed by Congressional enactment, but simply acted upon "newly-acquired Territories," the condition of which was not already fixed by Congressional enactment. The two transactions related to

different subject-matters. *Secondly*: The enactments do not directly touch the subject of slavery, during the Territorial existence of Utah and New Mexico; but they provide prospectively, that, when admitted as States, they shall be received "with or without slavery." Here certainly can be no overthrow of an act of Congress which directly concerns a Territory *during its Territorial existence*. *Thirdly*: During all the discussion of these measures in Congress, and afterwards before the people, and through the public press, at the North and the South alike, no person was heard to intimate that the Prohibition of Slavery in the Missouri act was in any way disturbed. And, *fourthly*: The acts themselves contain a formal provision, that "nothing herein contained shall be construed to impair or qualify anything" in a certain article of the resolutions annexing Texas, wherein it is expressly declared, that in territory north of the Missouri Compromise line, "slavery, or involuntary servitude, except for crime, shall be prohibited."

But I do not dwell on these things. These pretences have been already amply refuted by able Senators who have preceded me. It is clear, beyond contradiction, that the Prohibition of Slavery in this Territory has not been superseded or in any way contravened by the Slavery Acts of 1850. The proposition before you is, therefore, original in its character, without sanction from any former legislation, and it must, accordingly, be judged by its merits, as an original proposition.

Here, sir, let it be remembered, that the friends of Freedom are not open to any charge of aggression. They are now standing on the defensive, guarding the early entrenchments thrown up by our fathers. No proposition to abolish slavery anywhere is now before you; but, on the contrary, a proposition to abolish Freedom. The term Abolitionist, which is so often applied in reproach, justly belongs, on this occasion, to him who would overthrow this well-established landmark. He is, indeed, no Abolitionist of Slavery; let him be called, sir, an Abolitionist of Freedom. For myself, whether with many or few, my place is taken. Even if alone, my feeble arm should not be wanting as a bar against this outrage.

On two distinct grounds, "both strong

against the deed," I arraign it: *First*, in the name of Public Faith, as an infraction of solemn obligations, assumed beyond recall by the South, on the admission of Missouri into the Union as a slave State: *Secondly*, I arraign it, in the name of Freedom, as an unjustifiable departure from the original anti-slavery policy of our fathers. These two heads I propose to consider in their order, glancing under the latter at the objections to the Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories.

And here, sir, before I approach the argument, indulge me with a few preliminary words on the character of this proposition. Slavery is the forcible subjection of one human being, in person, labor, and property, to the will of another. In this simple statement is involved its whole injustice. There is no offence against religion, against morals, against humanity, which may not, in the license of this institution, stalk "unwhipt of justice." For the husband and wife there is no marriage; for the mother there is no assurance that her infant child will not be ravished from her breast; for all who bear the name of Slave, there is nothing that they can call their own. Without a father, without a mother, almost without a God, the slave has nothing but a master. It would be contrary to that Rule of Right, which is ordained by God, if such a system, though mitigated often by a patriarchal kindness, and by a plausible physical comfort, could be otherwise than pernicious in its influences. It is confessed, that the master suffers not less than the slave. And this is not all. The whole social fabric is disorganized; labor loses its dignity; industry sickens; education finds no schools, and all the land of slavery is impoverished. And now, sir, when the conscience of mankind is at last aroused to these things; when, throughout the civilized world, a slave-dealer is a by-word and a reproach, we, as a nation, are about to open a new market to the traffickers in flesh, that haunt the shambles of the South. Such an act, at this time, is removed from all reach of that palliation often vouchsafed to slavery. This wrong, we are speciously told, by those who seek to defend it, is not our original sin. It was entailed upon us, so we are instructed, by our ancestors; and the responsibility is often, with exultation, thrown upon the mother country. Now,

without stopping to inquire into the value of this apology, which is never adduced in behalf of other abuses, and which availed nothing against that kingly power, imposed by the mother country, which our fathers overthrew, it is sufficient for the present purpose, to know, that it is now proposed to make slavery our own original act. Here is a fresh case of actual transgression, which we cannot cast upon the shoulders of any progenitors, nor upon any mother country, distant in time or place. The Congress of the United States, the people of the United States, at this day, in this vaunted period of light, will be responsible for it, so that it shall be said hereafter, so long as the dismal history of slavery is read, that, in the year of Christ 1854, a new and deliberate act was passed, by which a vast Territory was opened to its inroads.

Alone in the company of nations does our country assume this hateful championship. In despotic Russia, the serfdom which constitutes the "peculiar institution" of that great empire, is never allowed to travel with the imperial flag, according to the American pretension, into provinces newly acquired by the common blood and treasure, but is carefully restricted by positive prohibition, in harmony with the general conscience, within its ancient confines; and this prohibition—the Wilmot proviso of Russia—is rigorously enforced on every side, in all the provinces, as in Bessarabia on the south, and Poland on the west, so that, in fact, no Russian nobleman has been able to move into these important territories with his slaves. Thus Russia speaks for freedom, and disowns the slaveholding dogma of our country. Far away in the East, at the "gateways of the day," in effeminate India, slavery has been condemned. In Constantinople, the queenly seat of the most powerful Mohammedan empire, where barbarism still mingles with civilization, the Ottoman Sultan has fastened upon it the stigma of disapprobation. The Barbary States of Africa, occupying the same parallels of latitude with the slave States of our Union, and resembling them in the nature of their boundaries, their productions, their climate, and the "peculiar institution," which sought shelter in both, have been changed into abolitionists. Algiers, seated on the line of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , has been dedicated to Freedom.

Morocco, by its untutored ruler, has expressed its desire, stamped in the formal terms of a treaty, that the very name of Slavery may perish from the minds of men; and only recently, from the Dey of Tunis, has proceeded that noble act, by which, "in honor of God, and to distinguish man from the brute creation"—I quote his own words—he decreed its total abolition throughout his dominions. Let Christian America be willing to be taught by these examples. God forbid that our republic—"heir of all the ages, foremost in the files of time"—should adopt anew the barbarism which they have renounced.

As the effort now making is extraordinary in character, so no assumption seems too extraordinary to be wielded in its support. The primal truth of the Equality of men, proclaimed in our Declaration of Independence, has been assailed, and this Great Charter of our country discredited. Sir, you and I will soon pass away, but that charter will continue to stand above impeachment or question. The Declaration of Independence was a Declaration of Rights, and the language employed, though general in its character, must obviously be restrained within the design and sphere of a Declaration of Rights, involving no such absurdity as was attributed to it yesterday by the Senator from Indiana, [Mr. PETTIT.] Sir, it is a palpable fact that men are not born equal in physical strength or in mental capacities, in beauty of form or health of body. These mortal cloaks of flesh differ, as do these worldly garments. Diversity or inequality, in these respects, is the law of creation. But as God is no respecter of persons, and as all are equal in his sight, whether Dives or Lazarus, master or slave, so are all equal in natural inborn rights; and, pardon me, if I say, it is a vain sophism to adduce in argument against this vital axiom of Liberty, the physical or mental inequalities by which men are characterized, or the unhappy degradation to which, in violation of a common brotherhood, they are doomed. To deny the Declaration of Independence is to rush on the bosses of the shield of the Almighty, which, in all respects, the supporters of this measure seem to do.

To the delusive suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina, [Mr. BANCER,]

that, by the overthrow of this prohibition, the number of slaves will not be increased; that there will be simply a beneficent diffusion of slavery, and not its extension, I reply at once, that this argument, if of any value—if not mere words and nothing else—would equally justify and require the overthrow of the Prohibition of Slavery in the free States, and indeed, everywhere throughout the world. All the dikes which, in different countries, from time to time, with the march of civilization, have been painfully set up against the inroads of this evil, must be removed, and every land opened anew to its destructive flood. It is clear, beyond dispute, that by the overthrow of this prohibition, slavery will be quickened, and slaves themselves will be multiplied, while “new room and verge” will be secured for the gloomy operations of slave law, under which free labor will droop, and a vast territory be smitten with sterility. Sir, a blade of grass would not grow where the horse of Attila had trod; nor can any true prosperity spring up in the foot-prints of the slave.

But it is argued that slaves will not be carried into Nebraska in large numbers, and that, therefore, the question is of small practical moment. My distinguished colleague, [Mr. EVERETT,] in his eloquent speech, hearkened to this apology, and allowed himself, while upholding the prohibition, to disparage its importance in a manner, from which I feel obliged kindly, but most strenuously, to dissent. Sir, the census shows that it is of vital consequence. There is Missouri, at this moment, with Illinois on the east and Nebraska on the west, all covering nearly the same spaces of latitude, and resembling each other in soil, climate, and natural productions. Mark now the contrast! By the potent efficacy of the ordinance of the Northwestern Territory, Illinois is now a free State, while Missouri has 87,422 slaves; and the simple question which challenges an answer is, whether Nebraska shall be preserved in the condition of Illinois, or surrendered to that of Missouri? Surely this cannot be treated lightly. But for myself, I am unwilling to measure the exigency of the prohibition by the number of persons, whether many or few, whom it may protect. Human rights, whether in a vast multitude or a solitary

individual, are entitled to an equal and unhesitating support. In this spirit, the flag of our country only recently became the impenetrable panoply of a homeless wanderer, who claimed its protection in a distant sea; and in this spirit I am constrained to declare that there is no place accessible to human avarice, or human lust, or human force—whether in the lowest valley, or on the loftiest mountain top, whether on the broad flower-spangled prairies, or the snowy caps of the Rocky Mountains—where the Prohibition of Slavery, like the commandments of the Decalogue, should not go.

But leaving these things behind, I press at once to the argument.

I. And now, sir, in the name of that Public Faith, which is the very ligament of civil society, and which the great Roman orator tells us it is detestable to break even with an enemy, I arraign this scheme, and hold it up to the judgment of all who hear me. There is an early Italian story of an experienced citizen, who, when told by his nephew that he had been studying, at the University of Bologna, the science of *right*, said in reply, “You have spent your time to little purpose. It would have been better had you learned the science of *might*, for that is worth two of the other;” and the bystanders of that day all agreed that the veteran spoke the truth. I begin, sir, by assuming that honorable Senators will not act in this spirit—that they will not substitute *might* for *right*—that they will not wantonly and flagitiously discard any obligation, pledge, or covenant, because they chance to possess the power; but that, as honest men, desirous to do right, they will confront this question.

Sir, the proposition before you involves not merely the repeal of an existing law, but the infraction of solemn obligations originally proposed and assumed by the South, after a protracted and embittered contest, as a covenant of peace—with regard to certain specified territory therein described, namely: “All that Territory ceded by France to the United States, under the name of Louisiana;” according to which, in consideration of the admission into the Union of Missouri as a slave State, slavery was forever prohibited in all the remaining part of this Territory which lies north of 36 deg. 30 min. This ar-

angement, between different sections of the Union—the slave States of the first part and the free States of the second part—though usually known as the Missouri Compromise, was at the time styled a **COMPACT**. In its stipulations for slavery, it was justly repugnant to the conscience of the North, and ought never to have been made; but on that side it has been performed. And now the unperformed outstanding obligations to Freedom, originally proposed and assumed by the South, are resisted.

Years have passed since these obligations were embodied in the legislation of Congress, and accepted by the country. Meanwhile, the statesmen by whom they were framed and vindicated have, one by one, dropped from this earthly sphere. Their living voices cannot now be heard, to plead for the preservation of that Public Faith to which they were pledged. But this extraordinary lapse of time, with the complete fruition by one party of all the benefits belonging to it, under the compact, gives to the transaction an added and most sacred strength. Prescription steps in with new bonds, to confirm the original work, to the end that while men are mortal, controversies shall not be immortal. Death, with inexorable scythe, has mowed down the authors of this compact; but, with conservative hour-glass, it has counted out a succession of years, which now defile before us, like so many sentinels, to guard the sacred landmark of Freedom.

A simple statement of facts, derived from the journals of Congress and contemporary records, will show the origin and nature of this compact, the influence by which it was established, and the obligations which it imposed.

As early as 1818, at the first session of the fifteenth Congress, a bill was reported to the House of Representatives, authorizing the people of the Missouri Territory to form a Constitution and State Government, for the admission of such State into the Union; but, at that session, no final action was had thereon. At the next session, in February, 1819, the bill was again brought forward, when an eminent Representative of New York, whose life has been spared till this last summer, Mr. JAMES TALLMADGE, moved a clause prohibiting any further introduction of slaves

into the proposed State, and securing freedom to the children born within the State after its admission into the Union, on attaining twenty-five years of age. This important proposition, which assumed a power not only to prohibit the ingress of slavery into the State itself, but also to abolish it there, was passed in the affirmative, after a vehement debate of three days. On a division of the question, the first part, prohibiting the further introduction of slaves, was adopted by 87 yeas to 76 nays; the second part, providing for the emancipation of children, was adopted by 82 yeas to 78 nays. Other propositions to thwart the operation of these amendments were voted down, and on the 17th of February the bill was read a third time, and passed, with these important restrictions.

In the Senate, after debate, the provision for the emancipation of children was struck out by 31 yeas to 7 nays; the other provision, against the further introduction of slavery, was struck out by 22 yeas to 16 nays. Thus emasculated, the bill was returned to the House, which, on March 2d, by a vote of 78 nays to 76 yeas, refused its concurrence. The Senate adhered to their amendments, and the House, by 78 yeas to 66 nays, adhered to their disagreement; and so at this session the Missouri bill was lost: and here was a temporary triumph of Freedom.

Meanwhile, the same controversy was renewed on the bill pending at the same time for the organization of the Territory of Arkansas, then known as the southern part of the Territory of Missouri. The restrictions already adopted in the Missouri bill were moved by Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, subsequently Speaker; but after at least six close votes, on the yeas and nays, in one of which the House was equally divided, 88 yeas to 88 nays, they were lost. Another proposition by Mr. TAYLOR, simpler in form, that slavery should not hereafter be introduced into this Territory, was lost by 90 nays to 86 yeas; and the Arkansas bill on February 25th was read the third time and passed. In the Senate, Mr. BURRILL, of Rhode Island, moved, as an amendment, the prohibition of the further introduction of slavery into this Territory, which was lost by 19 nays to 14 yeas. And thus, without any provision for Freedom, Arkansas

was organized as a Territory; and here was a triumph of Slavery.

At this same session, Alabama was admitted as a slave State, without any restriction or objection.

It was in the discussion on the Arkansas bill, at this session, that we find the earliest suggestion of a Compromise. Defeated in his efforts to prohibit slavery in this territory, Mr. Taylor stated that "he thought it important that some line should be designated beyond which slavery should not be permitted," and he moved its prohibition hereafter in all territories of the United States north of  $36^{\circ} 30'$ , north latitude, *without any exception of Missouri, which is north of this line.* This proposition, though withdrawn after debate, was at once welcomed by Mr. Livermore, of New Hampshire, "as made in the true spirit of compromise." It was opposed by Mr. Rhea, of Tennessee, on behalf of Slavery, who avowed himself against every restriction; and also by Mr. Ogle, of Pennsylvania, on behalf of Freedom, who was "against any Compromise by which slavery, in any of the Territories, should be recognised or sanctioned by Congress." In this spirit it was opposed and supported by others, among whom was General Harrison, afterwards President of the United States, who "assented to the expediency of establishing some such line of discrimination;" but proposed a line due west from the mouth of the Des Moines, thus constituting the northern, and not the southern boundary of Missouri, the partition line between Freedom and Slavery.

But this idea of Compromise, though suggested by TAYLOR, was thus early adopted and vindicated in this very debate, by an eminent character, Mr. Louis McLANE, of Delaware, who has since held high office in the country, and enjoyed no common measure of public confidence. Of all the leading actors in these early scenes, he and Mr. MERCER alone are yet spared. On this occasion he said :

"The fixing of a line on the west of the Mississippi, north of which slavery should not be tolerated, *had always been with him a favorite policy*, and he hoped the day was not distant when, upon principles of *fair compromise*, it might constitutionally be effected. The present attempt he regarded as premature."

After opposing the restriction on Missouri, he concluded by declaring :

"At the same time, I do not mean to abandon the policy to which I alluded in the commencement of my remarks. I think it but fair that both sections of the Union should be accommodated on this subject, with regard to which so much feeling has been manifested. The same great motives of policy which reconciled and harmonized the jarring and discordant elements of our system originally, and which enabled the framers of our happy Constitution to compromise the different interests which then prevailed on this and other subjects, if properly cherished by us, will enable us to achieve similar objects. If we meet upon principles of reciprocity, we cannot fail to do justice to all. *It has already been avowed, by gentlemen on this floor from the South and the West, that they will agree upon a line which shall divide the slaveholding from the non-slaveholding States. It is this proposition I am anxious to effect; but I wish to effect it by some compact which shall be binding upon all parties, and all subsequent Legislatures;* which cannot be changed, and will not fluctuate with the diversity of feeling and of sentiment to which this empire, in its march, must be destined. There is a vast and immense tract of country west of the Mississippi, yet to be settled, and intimately connected with the Northern section of the Union, upon which this compromise can be effected."

The suggestions of Compromise were at this time vain; each party was determined. The North, by the prevailing voice of its representatives, claimed all for Freedom; the South, by its potential command of the Senate, claimed all for Slavery.

The report of this debate aroused the country. For the first time in our history, Freedom, after an animated struggle, hand to hand, had been kept in check by Slavery. The original policy of our Fathers in the restriction of slavery was suspended, and this giant wrong threatened to stalk into all the broad national domain. Men at the North were humbled and amazed. The imperious demands of slavery seemed incredible. Meanwhile, the whole subject was adjourned from Congress to the people. Through the press and at public meetings, an earnest voice was raised against the admission of Missouri into the Union without the restriction of slavery. Judges left the bench and clergymen the pulpit, to swell the indignant protest which went up from good men, without distinction of party or of pursuit.

The movement was not confined to a few persons, nor to a few States. A public meeting at Trenton, in New Jersey, was followed by others in New York and Philadelphia, and finally at Worcester, Salem, and Boston, where committees

were organized to rally the country. The citizens of Baltimore, convened at the court-house, with the Mayor in the chair, resolved that the future admission of slaves into the States hereafter formed west of the Mississippi, ought to be prohibited by Congress. Villages, towns, and cities, by memorial, petition, and prayer, called upon Congress to maintain the great principle of the prohibition of slavery. The same principle was also commended by the resolutions of State Legislatures; and Pennsylvania, inspired by the teachings of Franklin and the convictions of the respectable denomination of Friends, unanimously asserted at once the right and the duty of Congress to prohibit slavery west of the Mississippi, and solemnly appealed to her sister States "to refuse to covenant with crime." New Jersey and Delaware followed, both also unanimously. Ohio asserted the same principle; so did also Indiana. The latter State, not content with providing for the future, severely censured one of its Senators, for his vote to organize Arkansas without the prohibition of slavery. The resolutions of New York were reinforced by the recommendation of DE WITT CLINTON.

Amidst these excitements, Congress came together in December, 1819, taking possession of these Halls of the Capitol for the first time since their desolation by the British. On the day after the receipt of the President's Message, two several committees of the House were constituted, one to consider the application of Maine, and the other of Missouri, to enter the Union as separate and independent States. With only the delay of a single day, the bill for the admission of Missouri was reported to the House without the restriction of slavery; but, as if shrinking from the immediate discussion of the great question it involved, afterwards, on the motion of Mr. MERCER, of Virginia, its consideration was postponed for several weeks; all which, be it observed, is in open contrast with the manner in which the present discussion has been precipitated upon Congress. Meanwhile, the Maine bill, when reported to the House, was promptly acted upon, and sent to the Senate.

In the interval between the report of the Missouri bill and its consideration by the House, a committee was constituted,

on motion of Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, to inquire into the expediency of prohibiting the introduction of slavery into the Territories west of the Mississippi. This committee, at the end of a fortnight, was discharged from further consideration of the subject, which, it was understood, would enter into the postponed debate on the Missouri bill. This early effort to interdict slavery in the Territories by a special law is worthy of notice, on account of some of the expressions of opinion which it drew forth. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Taylor declared, that "he presumed there were no members—he knew of none—who doubted the constitutional power of Congress to impose such a restriction on the Territories.

A generous voice from Virginia recognised at once the right and duty of Congress. This was from Charles Fenton Mercer, who declared that "When the question proposed should come fairly before the House, he should support the proposition. He should record his vote against suffering the dark cloud of inhumanity, which now darkened his country, from rolling on beyond the peaceful shores of the Mississippi."

At length, on the 26th January, 1820, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Missouri Bill, and proceeded with its discussion, day by day, till the 28th of February, when it was reported back with amendments. But meanwhile the same question was presented to the Senate, where a conclusion was reached earlier than in the House. A clause for the admission of Missouri was moved by way of tack to the Maine bill. To this an amendment was moved by Mr. Roberts, of Pennsylvania, prohibiting the further introduction of slavery into the State, which, after a fortnight's debate, was defeated by 27 nays to 16 yeas.

The debate in the Senate was of unusual interest and splendor. It was especially illustrated by an effort of transcendent power from that great lawyer and orator, WILLIAM PINKNEY. Recently returned from a succession of missions to foreign courts, and at this time the acknowledged chief of the American bar, particularly skilled in questions of constitutional law, his course as a Senator from Maryland was calculated to produce a profound impression. In a speech which drew for two

to this chamber an admiring throng, and at the time was fondly compared with the best examples of Greece and Rome, he first authoritatively proposed and developed the Missouri Compromise. His masterly effort was mainly directed against the restriction upon Missouri, but it began and ended with the idea of compromise. "Notwithstanding," he says, "occasional appearances of rather an unfavorable description, I have long since persuaded myself that the *Missouri question*, as it is called, might be laid to rest, with innocence and safety, by some *conciliatory Compromise* at least, by which, as is our duty, we might reconcile the extremes of conflicting views and feelings, without any sacrifice of constitutional principles." And he closed with the hope that the restriction on Missouri would not be pressed, but that the whole question "might be disposed of in a manner satisfactory to all, by a *positive prohibition of slavery in the Territory to the north and west of Missouri*."

This authoritative proposition of Compromise, from the most powerful advocate of the unconditional admission of Missouri, was made in the Senate on the 21st of January. From various indications, it seems to have found prompt favor in that body. Finally, on the 17th of February, the union of Maine and Missouri in one bill prevailed there, by 23 yeas to 21 nays. On the next day, Mr. Thomas, of Illinois, who had always voted with the South against any restriction upon Missouri, introduced the famous clause prohibiting slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min., which now constitutes the eighth section of the Missouri act. An effort was made to include the Arkansas Territory within this prohibition; but the South united against this extension of the area of Freedom, and it was defeated by 24 nays to 20 yeas. The prohibition, as moved by Mr. Thomas, then prevailed, by 34 yeas to only 10 nays. Among those in the affirmative were both the Senators from each of the slave States, Louisiana, Tennessee, Kentucky, Delaware, Maryland, and Alabama, and also one of the Senators from each of the slave States, Mississippi and North Carolina, including in the honorable list the familiar names of William Pinkney, James Brown, and William Rufus King.

This bill, thus amended, is the first legislative embodiment of the Missouri

Compact or Compromise, the essential conditions of which were, the admission of Missouri as a State without any restriction of slavery; and the prohibition of slavery in all the remaining Territory of Louisiana north of 36 deg. 30 min. Janus-faced, with one front towards Freedom and another towards Slavery, this must not be confounded with the simpler proposition of Mr. Taylor, at the last session, to prohibit slavery in all the territory north of 36 deg. 30 min., including Missouri. The compromise now brought forward—following the early lead of Mr. McLane—both recognised and prohibited slavery north of 36 deg. 30 min. Here, for the first time, these two opposite principles mingled in one legislative channel; and it is immediately subsequent to this junction that we discern the precise responsibility assumed by different parties. And now observe the indubitable and decisive fact. This bill, thus composed, containing these two elements—this double measure—finally passed the Senate by a test vote of 24 yeas to 20 nays. The yeas embraced every Southern Senator, except Nathaniel Macon, of North Carolina, and William Smith, of South Carolina.

Mr. BUTLER, (interrupting.) Mr. Gillard, of South Carolina, voted with Mr. Smith.

Mr. SUMNER. No, sir. The Journal, which I now hold in my hand, shows that he voted for the Compromise. I repeat, that the yeas on this vital question embraced every Southern Senator, except Mr. Macon and Mr. Smith. The nays embraced every Northern Senator, except the two Senators from Illinois and one Senator from Rhode Island, and one from New Hampshire. And this, sir, is the record of the first stage in the adoption of the Missouri Compromise. First openly announced and vindicated on the floor of the Senate, by a distinguished Southern statesman, it was forced on the North by an almost unanimous Southern vote.

While things had thus culminated in the Senate, discussion was still proceeding in the other House on the original Missouri bill. This was for a moment arrested by the reception from the Senate of the Maine bill, embodying the Missouri Compromise. Upon this the debate was brief and the decision prompt. But here, even at this stage, as at every other, a

Southern statesman intervenes. Mr. Smith, of Maryland, for many years an eminent Senator of that State, but at this time a Representative, while opposing the restriction of Missouri, vindicated the prohibition of slavery in the Territories, and thus practically accepted the Compromise :

"Mr. S. SMITH said that he rose principally with a view to state his understanding of the proposed amendment, viz: That it retained the boundaries of Missouri as delineated in the bill; that it prohibited the admission of slaves west of the west line of Missouri, and north of the north line; that it did not interfere with the Territory of Arkansas, or the uninhabited land west thereof. *He thought the proposition not exceptionable*, but doubted the propriety of its forming a part of the bill. He considered the power of Congress over the Territory as supreme, unlimited, before its admission; that Congress could impose on its Territories any restriction it thought proper; that if citizens go into the Territories thus restricted, they cannot carry with them slaves. They will be without slaves, and will be educated with prejudices and habits such as will exclude all desire, on their part, to admit slavery when they shall become sufficiently numerous to be admitted as a State. And this is the advantage proposed by the amendment."

But the House was not disposed to abandon the substantial restriction of slavery in Missouri, for what seemed its unsubstantial prohibition in an unsettled Territory. The Compromise was rejected, and the bill left in its original condition. This was done by large votes. Even the prohibition of slavery was thrown out by 159 yeas to 18 nays, both the North and the South uniting against it; though, in this small but persistent minority, we find two Southern statesmen, Samuel Smith and Charles Fenton Mercer. The Senate, on receiving the bill back from the House, insisted on their amendments. The House in turn insisted on their disagreement. According to parliamentary usage, a Committee of Conference between the two Houses was appointed. Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois, Mr. PINKNEY, of Maryland, and Mr. JAMES BARBOUR, of Virginia, composed this important committee on the part of the Senate; and Mr. HOLMES, of Maine, Mr. TAYLOR, of New York, Mr. LOWNDES, of South Carolina, Mr. PARKER, of Massachusetts, and Mr. KINSEY, of New Jersey, on the part of the House.

Meanwhile, the House had voted on the original Missouri bill. An amendment, peremptorily interdicting all slavery in the new State, was adopted by 94

yeas to 86 nays; and thus the bill passed the House, and was sent to the Senate, March 1st. Thus, after an exasperated and protracted discussion, the two Houses were at a dead-lock. The double-headed Missouri Compromise, was the ultimatum of the Senate. The restriction of slavery in Missouri, involving, of course, its prohibition in all the unorganized Territories, was the ultimatum of the House.

At this stage, on the 2d of March, the Committee of Conference made their report, which was urged at once upon the House by Mr. Lowndes, the distinguished Representative from South Carolina, and one of her most precious sons. And here sir, at the mention of this name, still so fragrant among us, let me for one moment stop this current of history, to express the tender admiration with which I am inspired. Mr. Lowndes died before my memory of political events; but he is still endeared by the single utterance—*that the Presidency is an office never to be sought*—which, by its beauty, shames the vileness of aspiration in our day, and will ever live as an amaranthine flower. Such a man on any occasion would be a host; but he now threw his great soul into the work. He even objected to a motion to print the report, on the ground "that it would imply a determination in the House to delay a decision of the subject to-day, which he had hoped the House was fully prepared for." The question then came, on striking out the restriction in the Missouri bill. The report in the *National Intelligencer* says :

"Mr. LOWNDES spoke briefly in support of the Compromise recommended by the Committee of Conference, and urged with great earnestness the propriety of a decision which would restore tranquillity to the country, which was demanded by every consideration of discretion, of moderation, of wisdom, and of virtue.

"Mr. MERCER, of Virginia, followed on the same side with great earnestness, and had spoken about half an hour, when he was compelled by indisposition to resume his seat."

Such efforts, pressed with Southern ardor, were not unavailing. In conformity with the report of the committee, the whole question was forthwith put at rest. Maine and Missouri were each admitted into the Union as independent States. The restriction of slavery in Missouri was abandoned by a vote in the House of 90 yeas to 87 nays; and the prohibition of

slavery in all Territories north of 36 deg. 30 min., exclusive of Missouri, was substituted by a vote of 134 yeas to 42 nays. Among the distinguished Southern names in the affirmative, are Louis McLane, of Delaware; Samuel Smith, of Maryland; William Lowndes, of South Carolina; and Charles Fenton Mercer, of Virginia. The title of the Missouri bill was amended in conformity with this prohibition, by adding the words, "and to prohibit slavery in certain Territories." *The bills then passed both Houses without a division*; and, on the morning of the 3d March, 1820, the *National Intelligencer* contained an exulting article, entitled: "The Question Settled."

Another paper, published in Baltimore, immediately after the passage of the Compromise, vindicated it as a perpetual compact, which could not be disturbed. The language is so clear and strong that I will read it, although it has been already quoted by my able and most excellent friend from Ohio, [Mr. CHASE:]

*"It is true the Compromise is supported only by the letter of the law, repealable by the authority which enacted it; but the circumstances of the case give this law a MORAL FORCE equal to that of a positive provision of the Constitution; and we do not hazard anything by saying that the Constitution exists in its observance.* Both parties have sacrificed much to conciliation. *We wish to see the COMPACT kept in good faith*, and we trust that a kind Providence will open the way to relieve us of an evil which every good citizen deprecates as the supreme curse of the country."—*Niles's Register*.

Sir, the distinguished leaders in this settlement were all from the South. As early as February, 1819, Louis McLANE, of Delaware, had urged it upon Congress, "by some compact binding upon all subsequent Legislatures." It was in 1820 brought forward and upheld in the Senate by WILLIAM PINKNEY, of Maryland, and passed in that body by the vote of every Southern Senator except two, against the vote of every Northern Senator except four. In the House, it was welcomed at once by SAMUEL SMITH, of Maryland, and CHARLES FENTON MERCER, of Virginia. The Committee of Conference, through which it finally prevailed, was filled, on the part of the Senate, with inflexible partisans of the South, such as might fitly represent the sentiments of its President, JOHN GAILLARD, a Senator from South Carolina; on the part of the House, it was nominated by

HENRY CLAY, the Speaker, and Representative from Kentucky. This committee, thus constituted, drawing its double life from the South, was unanimous in favor of the Compromise. A private letter from Mr. PINKNEY, written at the time, and preserved by his distinguished biographer, shows that the report made by the committee came from him:

*"The bill for the admission of Missouri into the Union (without restriction as to slavery) may be considered as past. That bill was sent back again this morning from the House, with the restriction as to Slavery. The senate voted to amend it by striking out the restriction, (27 to 15,) and proposed, as another amendment, what I have all along been the advocate of, a restriction upon the vacant territory to the north and west, as to slavery.* To-night the House of Representatives have agreed to both of these amendments, in opposition to their former votes, and this affair is settled. To-morrow we shall (of course) recede from our amendments as to Maine, (our object being effected,) and both States will be admitted. *This happy result has been accomplished by the Conference, of which I was a member on the part of the Senate, and of which I proposed the report which has been made.*"—*Wheaton's Life of Pinckney*.

Thus again the Compromise takes its life from the South. Proposed in the committee by Mr. Pinkney, it was urged on the House of Representatives, with great earnestness, by Mr. Lowndes, of South Carolina, and Mr. Mercer, of Virginia; and here again is the most persuasive voice of the South. When passed by Congress, it next came before the President, James Monroe, of Virginia, for his approval, who did not sign it till after the unanimous opinion, in writing, of his Cabinet, composed of John Quincy Adams, William H. Crawford, Smith Thompson, John C. Calhoun, and William Wirt—a majority of whom were Southern men—that the prohibition of slavery in the Territories was constitutional. Thus yet again the Compromise takes its life from the South.

As the Compromise took its life from the South, so the South, in the judgment of its own statesmen at the time, and according to unquestionable facts, was the conquering party. It gained forthwith its darling desire, the first and essential stage in the admission of Missouri as a slave State, successfully consummated at the next session; and subsequently the admission of Arkansas, also as a slave State. From the crushed and humbled North, it received more than the full con-

sideration stipulated in its favor. On the side of the North the contract has been more than executed. And now the South refuses to perform the part which it originally proposed and assumed in this transaction. With the consideration in its pocket, it repudiates the bargain which it forced upon the country. This, sir, is a simple statement of the present question.

A subtle German has declared, that he could find heresies in the Lord's Prayer—and I believe it is only in this spirit that any flaw can be found in the existing obligations of this compact. As late as 1848, in the discussions of this body, the Senator from Virginia, who usually sits behind me, [Mr. MASON,] but who is not now in his seat, while condemning it in many aspects, says:

"Yet as it was agreed to as a Compromise by the South for the sake of the Union, I would be the last to disturb it."—*Cong. Globe, Appendix, 1st sess. 30th Cong., Vol. 19, p. 887.*

Even this distinguished Senator recognised it as an obligation which he would not disturb. And, though disbelieving the original constitutionality of the arrangement, he was clearly right. I know, sir, that it is in form simply a legislative act; but as the Act of Settlement in England, declaring the rights and liberties of the subject, and settling the succession of the Crown, has become a permanent part of the British Constitution, irrepealable by any common legislation, so this act, under all the circumstances attending its passage, also by long acquiescence and the complete performance of its conditions by one party, has become a part of our fundamental law, irrepealable by any common legislation. As well might Congress at this moment undertake to overhaul the original purchase of Louisiana, as unconstitutional, and now, on this account, thrust away that magnificent heritage, with all its cities, States, and territories, teeming with civilization. The Missouri Compact, in its unperformed obligations to Freedom, stands at this day as impregnable as the Louisiana purchase.

I appeal to Senators about me, not to disturb it. I appeal to the Senators from Virginia, to keep inviolate the compact made in their behalf by JAMES BAREOUR and CHARLES FENTON MERCER. I appeal to the Senators from South Carolina, to guard the work of JOHN GAILLARD and

WILLIAM LOWNDES. I appeal to the Senators from Maryland, to uphold the Compromise which elicited the constant support of SAMUEL SMITH, and was first triumphantly pressed by the unsurpassed eloquence of PINKNEY. I appeal to the Senators from Delaware, to maintain the landmark of Freedom in the Territory of Louisiana, early espoused by LOUIS McLANE. I appeal to the Senators from Kentucky, not to repudiate the pledges of HENRY CLAY. I appeal to the Senators from Alabama, not to break the agreement sanctioned by the earliest votes in the Senate of their late most cherished fellow-citizen, WILLIAM RUFUS KING. Sir, I have heard of an honor that felt a stain like a wound. If there be any such in this chamber—as surely there is—it will hesitate to take upon itself the stain of this transaction.

Sir, Congress may now set aside this obligation, repudiate this plighted faith, annul this compact; and some of you, forgetful of the *majesty of honest dealing*, in order to support slavery, may consider it advantageous to use this power. To all such let me commend a familiar story: An eminent leader in antiquity, Themistocles, once announced to the Athenian Assembly, that he had a scheme to propose, highly beneficial to the State, but which could not be expounded to the many. Aristides, surnamed the Just, was appointed to receive the secret, and to report upon it. His brief and memorable judgment was, that, while nothing could be more advantageous to Athens, nothing could be more unjust; and the Athenian multitude, responding at once, rejected the proposition. It appears that it was proposed to burn the combined Greek fleet, which then rested in the security of peace in a neighboring sea, and thus confirm the naval supremacy of Athens. A similar proposition is now brought before the American Senate. You are asked to destroy a safeguard of Freedom, consecrated by solemn compact, under which the country is now reposing in the security of peace, and thus confirm the supremacy of Slavery. To this institution and its partisans the proposition may seem to be advantageous; but nothing can be more unjust. Let the judgment of the Athenian multitude be yours.

This is what I have to say upon this head.

I now pass to the second branch of the argument.

II. Mr. President, it is not only as an infraction of solemn compact, embodied in ancient law, that I arraign this bill. I arraign it also as a flagrant and extravagant departure from the original policy of our fathers, consecrated by their lives, opinions, and acts.

And here, sir, bear with me in a brief recital of unquestionable facts. At the period of the Declaration of Independence, there was upwards of half a million colored persons in slavery throughout the United Colonies. These unhappy people were originally stolen from Africa, or were the children of those who had been stolen, and, though distributed throughout the whole country, were to be found in largest number in the Southern States. But the spirit of Freedom then prevailed in the land. The fathers of the Republic, leaders in the war of Independence, were struck with the inconsistency of an appeal for their own liberties, while holding in bondage their fellow-men, only "guilty of a skin not colored like their own." The same conviction animated the hearts of the people, whether at the North or South. In a town meeting, at Danbury, Connecticut, held on the 12th of December, 1778, the following declaration was made :

"It is with singular pleasure we note the second article of the Association, in which it is agreed to import no more negro slaves, as we cannot but think it a palpable absurdity so loudly to complain of attempts to enslave us while we are actually enslaving others.—Am. Archives, 4th Series, Vol. I, p. 1038.

The South responded in similar strains. At a meeting in Darien, Georgia, in 1775, the following important resolution was put forth :

"To show the world that we are not influenced by any contracted or interested motives, but by a general philanthropy for all mankind, of whatever climate, language, or complexion, we hereby declare our disapprobation and abhorrence of the unnatural practice of Slavery in (however the uncultivated state of the country or other specious arguments may plead for it) a practice founded in injustice and cruelty, and highly dangerous to our liberties as well as lives, debasing part of our fellow-creatures below men, and corrupting the virtue and morals of the rest, and laying the basis of that liberty we contend for, and which we pray the Almighty to continue to the latest posterity, upon a very wrong foundation. We therefore resolve at all times to use our utmost endeavors for the manumission of our slaves

in this Colony, upon the most safe and equitable footing for the masters and themselves."—Am. Archives, 4th Series, Vol. I, p. 1135.

The soul of Virginia, during this period, found also fervid utterance through Jefferson, who, by precocious and immortal words, has enrolled himself among the earliest Abolitionists of the country. In his address to the Virginia Convention of 1774, he openly avowed, while vindicating the rights of British America, that "the abolition of domestic slavery is the greatest object of desire in these Colonies, *where it was unhappily introduced in their infant state.*" And then again, in the Declaration of Independence, he embodied sentiments, which, when practically applied, will give Freedom to every Slave throughout the land. "We hold these truths to be self-evident," says our country, speaking by the voice of Jefferson, "that all men are created equal—that they are endowed with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness." And again, in the Congress of the Confederation, he brought forward, as early as 1784, a resolution to exclude Slavery from all the Territory "ceded or to be ceded" by the States of the Federal Government, including the whole territory now covered by Tennessee, Mississippi, and Alabama. Lost at first by a single vote only, this measure was renewed in a more restricted form, at a subsequent day, by a son of Massachusetts, and in 1787 was finally confirmed in the Ordinance of the Northwestern Territory, by a unanimous vote of the States.

Thus early and distinctly do we discern the Anti-Slavery character of the founders of our Republic, and their determination to place the National Government, within the sphere of its jurisdiction, openly, actively, and perpetually, on the side of Freedom.

The National Constitution was adopted in 1788. And here we discern the same spirit. The emphatic words of the Declaration of Independence, which our country took upon its lips as baptismal vows, when it claimed its place among the nations of the earth, were not forgotten. The preamble to the Constitution renews them, when it declares its object to be, among other things, "to establish justice, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves

and posterity." Thus, according to undeniable words, the Constitution was ordained, not to establish, secure, or sanction Slavery—not to promote the special interest of slaveholders—not to make Slavery national in any way, form, or manner—not to foster this great wrong, but to "establish justice," "promote the general welfare," and "secure the blessings of Liberty." The discreditable words *Slave* and *Slavery* were not allowed to find a place in this instrument, while a clause was subsequently added by way of amendment, and, therefore, according to the rules of interpretation, particularly revealing the sentiments of the founders, which is calculated, like the Declaration of Independence, if practically applied, to carry Freedom to all within the sphere of its influence. It was specifically declared, that "no person shall be deprived of life, *liberty*, or property, without due process of law;" that is, without due presentment, indictment, or other judicial proceeding. Here is an express guard of personal Liberty, and an express interdict upon its invasion anywhere within the national jurisdiction.

It is evident, from the debates on the National Constitution, that slavery, like the slave trade, was regarded as temporary; and it seems to have been supposed by many that they would both disappear together. Nor do any words employed in our day denounce it with an indignation more burning than those which glowed on the lips of the Fathers. Early in the Convention, Governeur Morris, of Pennsylvania, broke forth in the language of an Abolitionist: "He never would concur in upholding domestic slavery. It was a nefarious institution. It was the curse of Heaven." In another mood, and with mild, juridical phrase, Mr. Madison "thought it wrong to admit in the Constitution the idea of property in man." And Washington, in letters written near this period—which completely describe the aims of an Abolitionist—avowed "that it was among his first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery may be abolished by law," and that to this end "his suffrage should not be wanting."

In this spirit was the National Constitution adopted. In this spirit the National Government was first organized under Washington. And here there is a fact of peculiar significance, to which I have

already, on a former occasion, called attention, but which is well worthy of perpetual memory. At the time that this great chief took his first oath to support the Constitution of the United States, *the national ensign nowhere within the national Territory covered a single slave*. On the sea, an execrable piracy, the trade in slaves, was still, to the national scandal, tolerated under the national flag. In the States, as a sectional institution, beneath the shelter of local laws, slavery unhappily found a home. But in the only Territories at this time belonging to the Nation, the broad region of the Northwest, it had already, by the Ordinance of Freedom, been made impossible, even before the adoption of the Constitution. The District of Columbia, with its Fatal Dowry, had not yet been acquired.

Entering upon his high duties, Washington, himself an Abolitionist, was surrounded by men, who, by their lives and declared opinions, were pledged to warfare with Slavery. There was John Adams, the Vice President—great vindicator and final negotiator of our national independence—whose soul, flaming with Freedom, broke forth in the early declaration, that "consenting to slavery is a sacrilegious breach of trust," and whose immittigable hostility to this wrong has been made immortal in his descendants. By his side, also, was a companion in arms and attached friend, the yet youthful and "incomparable" Hamilton—fit companion in early fame and genius with that darling of English history, Sir Philip Sydney, to whom the latter epithet has been reserved—who, as a member of the Abolition Society of New York, had only recently united in a solemn petition for those who, "though *free by the laws of God*, are held in slavery *by the laws of the State*." There, too, was a noble spirit, of spotless virtue, and commanding influence, the ornament of human nature, who, like the sun, ever held an unerring course, John Jay. Filling the important post of Minister of Foreign Affairs under the Confederation, he found time to organize the Abolition Society of New York, and to act as its President, until by the nomination of Washington he became Chief Justice of the United States. In his sight, slavery was an "iniquity"—"a sin of crimson dye," against which ministers of the gospel should testify, and

which the Government should seek in every way to abolish. "Were I in the Legislature," he wrote, "I would present a bill for the purpose with great care, and I would never cease moving it till it became a law or I ceased to be a member. Till America comes into this measure, her prayers to Heaven will be impious." By such men was Washington surrounded, while from his own Virginia came the voice of Patrick Henry, amidst confessions that he was a master of slaves, crying, "I will not, I cannot justify it. However culpable my conduct, I will so far pay my devoir to virtue as to own the excellence and rectitude of her precepts, and lament my want of conformity to them." Such words as these, fitly coming from our leaders, belong to the true glories of the country :

"While we such precedents can boast at home,  
Keep thy Fabricius and thy Cato, Rome!"

The earliest Congress under the Constitution adopted the Ordinance of Freedom for the Northwestern Territory, and thus ratified the prohibition of Slavery in all the existing Territories of the Union. In the list of those who sanctioned this act were men fresh from the labors of the Convention, and therefore familiar with its policy. But there is another voice which bears testimony in the same direction. Among the petitions presented to the first Congress, was one from the Abolition Society of Pennsylvania, signed by Benjamin Franklin, as President. This venerable votary of Freedom, who throughout a long life had splendidly served his country at home and abroad—who, as statesman and philosopher, had won the admiration of mankind—who had ravished the lightning from the skies and the sceptre from the tyrant—whose name, signed to the Declaration of Independence, gave added importance even to that great instrument, and then again signed to the Constitution of the United States, filled it with the charm of wisdom—in whom, more than in any other man, the true spirit of American Institutions, at once practical and humane, was embodied—who knew intimately the purposes and aspirations of the founders—this veteran statesman, then eighty-four years of age, appeared at the bar of that Congress, whose powers he had helped to define and establish, and, by the last political act of his long life, solemnly entreated "that it would be pleased to

countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men, who alone, in this land of Freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage," and "that it would step to the very verge of the power vested in it for DISCOURAGING every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow men." Only a short time after uttering this prayer, the patriot sage descended to the tomb; but he seems still to call upon Congress, in memorable words, *to step to the very verge of the powers vested in it to discourage slavery*; and this prayer, now sounding from the tomb of Franklin, proclaims the true national policy of the Fathers. Not encouragement, but discouragement of slavery, not its *nationalization*, but its *de-nationalization*, was their rule.

The memorial of Franklin, with other memorials of a similar character, was referred to a committee, and much debated in the House, which finally sanctioned the following resolution, and directed the same to be entered upon its journals, viz :

"That Congress have no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them, within any of the States; *it remaining with the several States to provide any regulations therein, which humanity and true policy may require.*"

This resolution, declaring the principle of non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States, was adopted by the same Congress which had solemnly affirmed the prohibition of slavery in all the existing territory of the Union; and not only by the same Congress, but at the same session, so that one may be regarded as the complement of the other. And it is on these double acts, at the first organization of the Government, and the recorded sentiments of the founders, that I take my stand, and challenge all question.

At this time there was strictly no dividing line in the country between Anti-Slavery and Pro-Slavery. The Anti-Slavery sentiment was thoroughly national, broad and general, pervading alike all parts of the Union; and uprising from the common heart of the entire people. The Pro-Slavery interest was strictly personal and pecuniary, and had its source simply in the self-interest of individual slaveholders. It contemplated slavery only as a domestic institution—not as a political element—and merely stipulated for its security where it actually existed within the States.

Sir, the original policy of the country,

begun under the Confederation, and recognised at the initiation of the new Government, is clear and unmistakable. Compendiously expressed, it was *non-intervention by Congress with slavery in the States, and its prohibition in all the national domain*. In this way, the discordant feelings on this subject were reconciled. Slave-masters were left at home in their respective States, under the protection of local laws, to hug slavery, without any interference from Congress, while all opposed to it were exempted from any responsibility therefor in the national domain. This, sir, is the common ground on which our political fabric was reared; and I do not hesitate to say that it is the only ground on which it can stand in permanent peace.

It is beyond question, sir, that our Constitution was framed by the lovers of Human Rights; that it was animated by their divine spirit; that the institution of slavery was regarded by them with aversion, so that, though covertly alluded to, it was not named in the instrument; that, according to the debates in the Convention, they refused to give it any "sanc-tion," and looked forward to the certain day when it would be obliterated from the land. But the original policy of the Government did not long prevail. The generous sentiments which filled the early patriots, giving to them historic grandeur, gradually lost their power. The blessings of freedom being already secured to themselves, the freemen of the land grew indifferent to the freedom of others. They ceased to think of the slaves. The slave-masters availed themselves of this indifference, and, though few in numbers, compared with the non-slaveholders, even in the slave States, (according to the late census they are fewer than 300,000,) they have, under the influence of an imagined self-interest, by the skillful tactics of party, and especially by an unhesitating, persevering union among themselves—swaying, by turns, both the great political parties—succeeded, through a long succession of years, in obtaining the control of the National Government, bending it to their purposes, compelling it to do their will, and imposing upon it a policy friendly to Slavery; offensive to Freedom only, and directly opposed to the sentiments of its founders. Our Republic has swollen in population and pow-

er; but it has shrunk in character. It is not now what it was at the beginning, a Republic merely permitting, while it regretted slavery; tolerating it only where it could not be removed, and interdicting it where it did not exist—but a mighty Propagandist, openly favoring and vindicating it; visiting, also, with displeasure all who oppose it.

Sir, our country early reached heights which it could not keep. Its fall was gentle but complete. At the session of Congress immediately following the ratification of the Prohibition of Slavery in the national domain, a transfer of the territory now constituting Tennessee was accepted from North Carolina, (April 2, 1790,) loaded with the express condition "that no regulation made, or to be made, should tend to emancipate slaves;" a formal provision, which, while admitting the power of Congress over slavery in the Territories, waived the prevailing policy of executing it. This was followed, in 1798, by the transfer from Georgia of the region between her present western limit and the Mississippi, under a similar condition. In both these cases, an apology may be found in the very terms of the transfers, and in the fact that the region constituted a part of two States where slavery actually existed; though it will be confessed that even here there was a descent from that summit of Freedom on which the Nation had so proudly rested:

— "From morn  
To noon he fell; from noon to dewy eve—  
A summer's day, and with the setting sun  
Drop'd from the zenith, like a falling star."

But, without tracing this downward course through its successive stages, let me refer to facts, which too palpably reveal the abyss that has been reached. Early in our history, no man was disqualified for public office by reason of his opinions on this subject; and this condition continued for a long period. As late as 1821, John W. Taylor, Representative from New York, who had pressed with so much energy, not merely the prohibition of Slavery in the Territories, but its restriction in the State of Missouri, was elected to the chair of Henry Clay, as Speaker of the other House. It is needless to add, that no determined supporter of the Wilmot Proviso at this day could expect that eminent trust. An ar-

rogant and unrelenting ostracism is now applied, not only to all who express themselves against slavery, but to every man who will not be its menial. A novel test for office has been introduced, which would have excluded all the Fathers of the Republic—even Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin. Yes, sir; startling it may be, but indisputable. Could these illustrious men descend from their realms above, and revisit the land which they had nobly dedicated to freedom, they could not, with their well-known and recorded opinions against slavery, receive a nomination for the Presidency from either of the old political parties. Nor could John Jay, our first Chief Justice, and great exemplar of judicial virtue—who hated slavery as he loved justice—be admitted to resume those duties with which his name on earth is indissolubly associated. To such lowest deep has our Government descended.

These things prepare us to comprehend the true character of the change with regard to the Territories. In 1787, all the existing national domain was promptly and unanimously dedicated to Freedom, without opposition or criticism. The interdict of slavery then covered every inch of soil belonging to the National Government. Louisiana, an immense region beyond the bounds of the original States, was subsequently acquired, and in 1820, after a vehement struggle, which shook the whole land, discomfited Freedom was compelled, by a dividing line, to a partition with Slavery. This arrangement, which, in its very terms, was exclusively applicable to a particular territory purchased from France, has been accepted as final down to the present session of Congress; but now, sir, here in 1854, Freedom is suddenly summoned to surrender even her hard-won moiety. Here are the three stages: at the first, all is consecrated to Freedom; at the second, only half; while at the third, all is to be opened to Slavery. Thus is the original policy of the Government absolutely reversed. Slavery, which, at the beginning, was a sectional institution, with no foothold anywhere on the national territory, is now exalted as a national institution, and all our broad domain is threatened by its blighting shadow.

Thus much for what I have to say, at this time, of the original policy, consecrated by the lives, opinions, and acts of our Fathers. Summoning to my side the majestic forms of these civil heroes, whose firmness in council was only equalled by the firmness of Washington in war, I might leave the cause in their care. But certain reasons are adduced for the proposed departure from their great example, and, though these seem of great validity, yet I would not pass them in silence.

The Prohibition of Slavery in the Territories is assailed, as beyond the power of Congress, and an infringement of the local sovereignty. On this account it is, at this late day, pronounced unconstitutional. Now, without considering minutely the sources from which the power of Congress over the national domain is derived—whether from the express grant in the Constitution to make rules and regulations for the government of the Territory, or from the power, necessarily implied, to govern territory acquired by conquest or purchase—it seems to me impossible to deny its existence, without invalidating a large portion of the legislation of the country, from the adoption of the Constitution down to the present day. This power was asserted before the Constitution. It was not denied or prohibited by the Constitution itself. It has been exercised from the first existence of the Government, and has been recognised by the three departments—the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial. Precedents of every kind are thick in its support. Indeed, the very bill now before us, assumes a control of the territory clearly inconsistent with those principles of sovereignty, which are said to be violated by a Congressional prohibition of slavery.

Here are provisions, determining the main features in the Government—the distribution of powers in the Executive, the Legislative, and Judicial departments, and the manner in which they shall be respectively constituted—securing to the President, with the consent of the Senate, the appointment of the governor, the secretary, and the judges, and to the people the election of the legislature—ordinating the qualifications of voters, the salaries of the public officers, and the daily compensation of the members of the legislature.

Surely, if Congress may establish these provisions, without any interference with the rights of territorial sovereignty, it is absurd to say that it may not also prohibit slavery.

But there is in the very bill an express prohibition on the Territory, borrowed from the Ordinance of 1787, and repeated in every act organizing a Territory, or even a new State, down to the present time, wherein it is expressly declared, that "no tax shall be imposed upon the property of the United States." Now, here is a clear and unquestionable restraint upon the sovereignty of Territories and States. The public lands of the United States, situated within an organized Territory or State, cannot be regarded as the *instruments and means* necessary and proper to execute the sovereign powers of the nation, like fortifications, arsenals, and navy yards. They are strictly in the nature of *private property* of the nation, and as such, unless exempted by the foregoing prohibition, would clearly be within the field of local taxation, liable, like the lands of other proprietors, to all customary burdens and incidents. Mr. Justice Woodbury has declared, in a well-considered judgment, that "where the United States own land situated within the limits of particular States, and over which they have no cession of jurisdiction, for objects either special or general, little doubt exists that the rights and remedies in relation to it are usually the same as apply to other landholders within the States."—(United States *vs.* 1 Woodbury and Minot, p. 76.) I assume, then, that without this prohibition these lands would be liable to taxation. Does any one question this? Nobody. The conclusion then follows, that by this prohibition you propose to deprive the present Territory, as you have deprived other Territories—aye, and States—of an essential portion of its sovereignty.

And these, sir, are not vain words. The Supreme Court of the United States have given great prominence to the sovereign right of taxation in the States. In the case of Providence Bank *vs.* Pittman, 4 Peters, 514, they declare—

"That the taxing power is of vital importance; that it is essential to the existence of Government; that the relinquishment of such power is never to be assumed;"

And again, in the case of Dobbins *vs.*

Commissioners of Erie County, 16 Peters, 447, they say—

"Taxation is a sacred right, *essential to the existence of Government—an incident of sovereignty.* The right of legislation is co-extensive with the incident to attach it upon all persons and property within the jurisdiction of the State."

Now, I call upon Senators to remark, that this sacred right, said to be essential to the very existence of Government, is abridged in the bill before us.

For myself, I do not doubt the power of Congress to fasten this restriction upon the Territory, and afterwards upon the State, as has been always done; but I am at a loss to see on what grounds this restriction can be placed, which will not also support the prohibition of slavery. The former is an unquestionable infringement of sovereignty, as declared by our Supreme Court, far more than can be asserted of the latter.

I am unwilling to admit, sir, that the prohibition of slavery in the Territories is in any just sense an infringement of the local sovereignty. Slavery is an infraction of the immutable law of nature, and, as such, cannot be considered a natural incident to any sovereignty, especially in a country which has solemnly declared, in its Declaration of Independence, the inalienable right of all men to life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness. In an age of civilization and in a land of rights, slavery may still be tolerated in fact; but its prohibition, within a municipal jurisdiction, by the Government thereof, as by one of the States of the Union, cannot be considered an infraction of natural rights; nor can its prohibition by Congress in the Territories be regarded as an infringement of the local sovereignty, founded, as it must be, on natural rights.

But another argument is pressed, most fallacious in its character. It is asserted that, inasmuch as the Territories were acquired by the common treasure, they are the common property of the whole Union; and, therefore, no citizen can be prevented from moving into them with his slaves, without an infringement of the equal rights and privileges which belong to him as a citizen of the United States. But, it is admitted that the people of this very Territory, when organized as a State, may exclude slaves, and in this way abridge an asserted right founded on the common property in the Territory. Now, if this

can be done by the few thousand settlers who constitute the State Government, the whole argument founded on the acquisition of the Territories, by a common treasure, seems futile and evanescent.

But this argument proceeds on an assumption which cannot stand. It assumes that slavery is a national institution, and that property in slaves is recognised by the Constitution of the United States. Nothing can be more false. By the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, and also by the principles of the common law, Slavery is a local municipal institution, which derives its support exclusively from local municipal laws, and beyond the sphere of these laws it ceases to exist, except so far as it may be preserved by the clause for the rendition of fugitives from labor. Madison thought it wrong to admit into the Constitution the idea that there can be property in man; and I rejoice to believe that no such idea can be found there. The Constitution regards slaves always as "persons," with the rights of "persons," never as property. When it is said, therefore, that every citizen may enter the national domain with his property, it does not follow, by any rule of logic or of law, that he may carry his slaves. On the contrary, he can only carry that property which is admitted to be such by the universal law of nature, written by God's own finger on the heart of man.

Again: The relation of master and slave is sometimes classed with the domestic relations. Now, while it is unquestionably among the powers of any State, within its own jurisdiction, to change the existing relation of husband and wife, and to establish polygamy, I presume no person would contend that a polygamous husband, resident in one of the States, would be entitled to enter the national Territory with his harem—his property, if you please—and there claim immunity. Clearly, when he passes the bounds of that local jurisdiction, which sanctions polygamy, the peculiar domestic relation would cease; and it is precisely the same with slavery.

Sir, I dismiss these considerations. The prohibition of slavery in the Territory of Nebraska stands on foundations of adamant, upheld by the early policy of the Fathers, by constant precedent, and

time-honored compact. It is now in your power to overturn it; you may remove the sacred landmark, and open the whole vast domain to Slavery. To you is committed this high prerogative. Our fathers, on the eve of the Revolution, set forth in burning words, among their grievances, that George III, "in order to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, had prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce." Sir, like the English monarch, you may now prostitute your power to this same purpose. But you cannot escape the judgment of the world, nor the doom of history.

It will be in vain, that, while doing this thing, you plead, in apology, the principle of *self-government*, which you profess to recognise in the Territories. Sir, this very principle, when truly administered, secures equal rights to all, without distinction of color or race, and makes slavery impossible. By no rule of justice, and by no subtlety of political metaphysics, can the right to hold a fellow-man in bondage be regarded as essential to self-government. The inconsistency is too flagrant. It is apparent on the bare statement. It is like saying *two* and *two* make *three*. In the name of liberty you open the door to slavery. With professions of Equal Rights on the lips, you trample on the rights of Human Nature. With a kiss upon the brow of that fair Territory, you betray it to wretchedness and shame. Well did the patriot soul exclaim, in bitter words, wrung out by bitter experience: "Oh Liberty! what crimes are done in thy name!"

In vain, sir, you will plead, that this measure proceeds from the North, as has been suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, [Mr. DIXON.] Even if this were true, it would be no apology. But, precipitated as this bill has been upon the Senate, at a moment of general calm, and in the absence of any controlling exigency, and then hurried to a vote in advance of the public voice, as if fearful of arrest, it cannot be justly called the offspring of any popular sentiment. In this respect it differs widely from the Missouri prohibition, which, after solemn debate, extending through two sessions of Congress, and ample discussion before the people, was

adopted. Certainly there is, as yet, no evidence that this measure, though supported by Northern men, proceeds from that Northern sentiment which is to be found, strong and fresh, in the schools, the churches, and homes of the people. *Populi omnes ad aquilonem positi Libertatem quandam spirant.* And could this scheme be now submitted to the awakened millions whose souls have been truly ripened under Northern skies, it would be branded at once with an indignant and undying condemnation.

But the race of men, "white slaves of the North," described and despised by a Southern statesman, is not yet extinct there, sir. It is one of the melancholy tokens of the power of slavery, under our political system, and especially through the operations of the National Government, that it loosens and destroys the character of Northern men, exerting its subtle influence even at a distance—like the black magnetic mountain in the Arabian story, under whose irresistible attraction the iron bolts, which held together the strong timbers of a stately ship, securely floating on the distant wave, were drawn out, till the whole fell apart, and became a disjointed wreck. Alas! too often those principles, which give consistency, individuality, and form, to the Northern character, which render it stanch, strong, and seaworthy, which bind it together as with iron, are sucked out, one by one, like the bolts of the ill-fated vessel, and from the miserable, loosened fragments is formed that human anomaly—a Northern man with Southern principles. Sir—No such man can speak for the North.

[Here there was an interruption of prolonged applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT, (Mr. STUART in the chair.) The Chair will be obliged to direct the galleries to be cleared, if order is not preserved. No applause will be allowed.

Several Voices. Let them be cleared now.

Mr. SUMNER. Mr. President, I advance now to considerations of a more general character, to which I ask your best attention. Sir, this bill is proposed as a measure of peace. In this way you vainly think to withdraw the subject of slavery from National politics. This is a mistake. Peace depends on mutual confidence. It can never rest secure on broken faith and injustice. And, sir, permit me to say, frankly, sincerely, and earnestly, that the

subject of slavery can never be withdrawn from the National politics, until we return once more to the original policy of our fathers, at the first organization of the Government, under Washington, when the National ensign nowhere on the National territory covered a single slave.

Slavery, which our fathers branded as an "evil," a "curse," an "enormity," a "nefarious institution," is condemned at the North by the strongest convictions of the reason and the best sentiments of the heart. It is the only subject within the field of National politics which excites any real interest. The old matters which have divided the minds of men have lost their importance. One by one they have disappeared, leaving the ground to be occupied by a question grander far. The Bank, Sub-Treasury, the Distribution of the Public Lands, are each and all obsolete issues. Even the Tarriff is not a question on which opposite political parties are united in taking opposite sides. And now, instead of these superseded questions, which were filled for the most part with the odor of the dollar, the country is directly summoned to consider face to face a cause which is connected with all that is divine in religion, with all that is pure and noble in morals, with all that is truly practical and constitutional in politics. Unlike the other questions, it is not temporary or local in its character. It belongs to all times and to all countries. Though long kept in check, it now, by your introduction, confronts the people, demanding to be heard. To every man in the land it says, with clear, penetrating voice, "Are you for Freedom, or are you for Slavery?" And every man in the land must answer this question when he votes.

Pass this bill, and it will be in vain that you say, the Slavery Question is settled. Sir, *nothing can be settled which is not right.* Nothing can be settled which is adverse to Freedom. God, nature and all the holy sentiments of the heart, repudiate any such false seeming settlement.

Now, sir, mark the clear line of our duty. And here let me speak for those with whom, in minority and defeat, I am proud to be associated, the Independent Democrats, who espouse that Democracy which is transfigured in the Declaration of Independence and the injunctions of Christianity. The testimony which we bear against slavery, as against all other

wrong, is in different ways, according to our position. The slavery, which exists under other Governments—as in Russia or Turkey—or in other States of the Union, as in Virginia and Carolina, we can oppose only through the influence of literature, morals, and religion, without in any way invoking the Political Power. Nor is it proposed to act otherwise. But slavery, where we are parties to it—where we are responsible for it—everywhere within our jurisdiction—must be opposed, not only by all the influence of literature, morals, and religion, but directly by every instrument of Political Power. In the States it is sustained by local laws, and although we may be compelled to share the shame, which its presence inflicts upon the fair fame of the country, yet it receives no direct sanction at our hands. We are not responsible for it. The wrong is not at our own particular doors. It is not within our jurisdiction. But slavery everywhere under the Constitution of the United States—everywhere within the exclusive jurisdiction of the National Government—everywhere under the National Flag, is at our own particular doors, within the sphere of our own personal responsibility, and exists there in defiance of the original policy of our Fathers and of the true principles of the Constitution.

It is a mistake to say, as is often charged, that we seek to interfere, through Congress, with slavery in the States, or in any way to direct the legislation of Congress upon subjects not within its jurisdiction. Our *political* aims, as well as our *political* duties, are co-extensive with our *political* responsibilities. And since we at the North are responsible for slavery wherever it exists under the jurisdiction of Congress, it is unpardonable in us not to exert every power we possess to enlist Congress against it.

Such is our cause. To men of all parties and opinions, who wish well to the Republic, and would preserve our good name, it appeals. Alike to the Conservative and the Reformer, it appeals; for it stands on the truest Conservatism and the truest Reform. In seeking the reform of existing evils, we seek also the conservation of the principles of our fathers. The cause is not sectional. Oh, no! sir, it is not sectional; for it simply aims to establish under the National Government those great principles of Justice and Humanity,

which are broad and universal as man. As well might it be said that Jefferson, Franklin, and Washington, were sectional. It is not aggressive; for it does not seek in any way to interfere, through Congress, with slavery in the States. It is not contrary to the Constitution; for it recognises this paramount law, and in the administration of the Government invokes the spirit of its founders. Sir, it is not hostile to the quiet of the country; for it proposes the only course by which agitation can be allayed, and quiet be permanently established.

It is not uncommon to hear persons declare that they are against slavery, and are willing to unite in any practical efforts to make this opposition felt. At the same time, they pharisaically visit with condemnation, with reproach or contempt, the earnest souls who for years have striven in this struggle. To such I would say—could I reach them now with my voice—if you are sincere in what you declare; if your words are not merely lip-service; if in your hearts you are entirely willing to join in any practical efforts against slavery, then by your lives, by your conversation, by your influence, by your votes—disregarding “the ancient forms of party strife”—seek to carry the principles of Freedom into the National Government, wherever its jurisdiction is acknowledged and its power can be felt. Thus, without any interference with the States, which are beyond this jurisdiction, may you help to erase the blot of slavery from our National brow.

Do this, and you will most truly promote the harmony which you so much desire. You will establish tranquillity throughout the country. Then at last, sir, the Slavery Question will be settled. Banished from its usurped foothold under the National Government, slavery will no longer enter, with distracting force, into the National politics—making and unmaking laws, making and unmaking Presidents. Confined to the States, where it was left by the Constitution, it will take its place as a local institution—if, alas! continue it must!—for which we are in no sense responsible, and against which we cannot exert any political power. We shall be relieved from our present painful and irritating connection with it. The existing antagonism between the North and South will be softened; crimination and recrimi-

ination will cease; the wishes of the Fathers will be fulfilled, and this Great Evil be left to the kindly influences of morals and religion, and the prevailing laws of social economy.

I am not blind to the adverse signs. But this I see clearly. Amidst all seeming discouragements, the great omens are with us. Art, literature, poetry, religion—everything which elevates man—all are on our side. The plow, the steam-engine, the railroad, the telegraph, the book, every human improvement, every generous word anywhere, every true pulsation of every heart which is not a mere muscle, and nothing else, gives new encouragement to the warfare with slavery. The discussion will proceed. The devices of party can no longer stave it off. The subterfuges of the politician cannot escape it. The tricks of the office-seeker cannot dodge it. Wherever an election occurs, there this question will arise. Wherever men come together to speak of public affairs, there again will it be. No political Joshua now, with miraculous power, can stop the sun in his course through the heavens. It is even now rejoicing, like a strong man, to run its race, and will yet send its beams into the most distant plantations—aye, sir, and melt the chains of every slave.

But this movement—or agitation, as it is reproachfully called—is boldly pronounced injurious to the very object desired. Now, without entering into details which neither time nor the occasion justifies, let me say that this objection belongs to those commonplaces, which have been arrayed against every beneficent movement in the world's history—against even knowledge itself—against the abolition of the slave trade. Perhaps it was not unnatural for the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BADGER] to press it, even as vehemently as he did; but it sounded less natural when it came, though in more moderate phrase, from my distinguished friend and colleague from Massachusetts, [Mr. EVERETT.] The past furnishes a controlling example by which its true character may be determined. Do not forget, sir, that the efforts of William Wilberforce encountered this precise objection, and that the condition of the kidnapped slave was then vindicated, in language not unlike that of the Senator from North Carolina, by no less a person than the Duke of

Clarence, of the royal family of Great Britain. In what was called his maiden speech, on May 3d, 1792, and preserved in the Parliamentary Debates, he said: "The negroes were not treated in the manner which had so much agitated the public mind. He had been an attentive observer of their state, and had no doubt that he could bring forward proofs to convince their lordships that their state was far from being miserable; on the contrary, that when the various ranks of society were considered, they were comparatively in a state of humble happiness." And only the next year this same royal prince, in debate in the House of Lords, asserted that the promoters of the abolition of the slave trade were "either fanatics or hypocrites," and in one of these classes he declared that he ranked Wilberforce. Mark now the end. After years of weary effort, the slave trade was finally abolished; and at last, in 1833, the early vindicator of even this enormity, the maligner of a name hallowed among men, was brought to give his royal assent, as William IV, King of Great Britain, to the immortal act of Parliament, greater far than any victory of war, by which slavery was abolished throughout the British dominions. Sir, time and the universal conscience have vindicated the labors of Wilberforce. The movement against American slavery, auspiced by the august names of Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson, can calmly await a similar judgment.

But it is suggested that, in this movement, there is danger to the Union. In this solicitude I cannot share. As a lover of concord and a jealous partisan of all things that make for peace, I am always glad to express my attachment to the Union; but I believe that this bond will be most truly preserved and most beneficially extended (for I shrink from no expansion where Freedom leads the way) by firmly upholding those principles of Liberty and Justice which were made its early corner-stones. The true danger to this Union proceeds, not from any abandonment of the "peculiar institution" of the South, but from the abandonment of the spirit in which the Union was formed; not from any warfare, within the limits of the Constitution, upon Slavery; but from warfare, like that waged by this very bill, upon Freedom. The Union is most precious; but more precious far are that

"general welfare," "domestic tranquility," and those "blessings of Liberty," which it was established to secure; all which are now wantonly endangered. Not that I love the Union less, but Freedom more, do I now, in pleading this great cause, insist that Freedom, at all hazards, shall be preserved.

One word more, and I have done. The great master, Shakspeare, who, with all-seeing mortal eye, observed mankind, and with immortal pen depicted the manners as they rise, has presented a scene which may be read with advantage by all who would plunge the South into tempestuous quarrel with the North. I refer to the well-known dialogue between Brutus and Cassius. Reading this remarkable passage, it is difficult not to see in Brutus our own North, and in Cassius the South:

*Cas.* Urge me no more, I shall forget myself; Have mind upon your health, tempt me no further.

*Bru.* Hear me, for I will speak. Must I give way and room to your rash choleric? *Cas.* O ye gods! ye gods! Must I endure all this?

*Bru.* All this? ay, more: Fret, till your proud heart break:

Go, show your slaves how choleric you are, And make your bondmen tremble. Must I budge? Must I observe you? Must I stand and crouch Under your testy humor?

*Cas.* Do not presume too much upon my love, I may do that I shall be sorry for.

*Bru.* You have done that you should be sorry for.

There is no terror, Cassius, in your threats; For I am arm'd so strong in honesty, 'at they pass by me, as the idle wind,

Which I respect not.

*Cas.* A friend should bear his friend's infirmities, But Brutus makes mine greater than they are.

*Bru.* I do not, TILL YOU PRACTICE THEM ON ME.

*Cas.* You love me not.

*Bru.* I do not like your faults.

*Julius Casar, Act 4, scene 3.*

And the colloquy proceeding, each finally comes to understand the other, appreciates his character and attitude, and the impetuous gallant Cassius exclaims, "Give me your hand;" to which Brutus replies, "And my heart too." Afterwards, with hand and heart united, on the field of Philippi they together upheld the liberties of Rome

The North and the South, sir, as I fondly trust, amidst all differences, will ever have a hand and heart for each other; and, believing in the sure prevalence of Almighty Truth, I confidently look forward to the good time, when both will unite, according to the sentiments of the Fathers and the true spirit of the Constitution, in declaring Freedom and not Slavery *national*, to the end that the Flag of the Republic, wherever it floats, on sea or land, within the *national* jurisdiction, may not cover a single slave. Then will be achieved that Union, contemplated at the beginning, against which the storms of faction and the assaults of foreign power shall beat in vain, as upon the Rock of Ages; and LIBERTY, seeking a firm foothold, WILL HAVE AT LAST WHEREON TO STAND AND MOVE THE WORLD.

BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS, WASHINGTON, D. C.









